

Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME II.]

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1856.

[NUMBER 3.]

The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.
Is Published Monthly,
AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.
BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

TERMS.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

✉ All letters must be post-paid.

✉ Small change, or sums less than one dollar, may be sent in post-office stamps; or, if stamps cannot be procured, one dollar may be sent, and the balance will be sent back in stamps deducting postage.

PROSPECTUS.

The "RADICAL ABOLITIONIST" proposes a proclamation of "liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." It demands of the *American Government* and the *American People*, the immediate and unconditional abolition of *American Slavery*.

It makes this demand on behalf of three millions of Americans already enslaved, on behalf of twenty millions more in process of becoming enslaved, and in behalf of the untold millions of their posterity, who must be enslaved for ages to come, unless American Slavery be overthrown.

It urges this demand in the name of humanity chattelized, republicanism disgraced, religion dishonored, the Holy Scriptures perverted, the Saviour blasphemed, the laws of nature and of nature's God trampled under foot.

It denies that the Federal Government, under the Federal Constitution, has either a moral or a political right to tolerate slavery, in any of the States belonging to the Federal Union, for a single day.

"The United States SHALL guarantee to EVERY State in the Union a republican form of government."—*Constitution*.

"The foundation of republican government is the right of every citizen, in his person and property, and in their management."—*Jefferson*.

It denies that "the reserved rights of the States" include any such right as that of holding property in man, as no such "right" can exist; and Mr. Madison tells us that the Federal Convention would not permit the Constitution to recognize any such right.—*Vide Madison Papers*.

It affirms that the Constitution unequivocally inhibits the States from maintaining slavery.

"No State shall pass any bill of attainder, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts." And "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."—*Constitution*.

It affirms that the Constitution was formed by "the people of the United States," (all of them,) "to secure the blessings of LIBERTY for (themselves) and (their) posterity," without exception or distinction of race or color. And hence, no portion of "the people of the United States" can be constitutionally enslaved, and the declared object of the Constitution requires the Federal Government to "secure the blessings of liberty" to each and all of them.

If the Constitution is not available for these purposes, it is of no practical value, it is condemned by its own high professions, and the people have no alternative left them but to provide a better government for their protection, or become the serfs of the petty oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders, who are now suffered to control and insult a great nation.

The "RADICAL ABOLITIONIST" recognizes as valid law no unrighteous enactments. It affirms, with all the great writers on Common Law, "that statutes against fundamental morality are void;" that "no human laws have any validity if contrary to the law of God, and such of them as are valid derive all their force, mediately, or immediately, from this original."

—FORTESCUE.

On this ground, as well as from the admitted absence of any positive law in this country, establishing slavery; from the known incompetency of the colonial legislatures under British common law, to legalize it; from the ascertained illegality of the African slave trade, by which the colonies were supplied with slaves; and from the unanimous declaration of the thirteen original States, the very act of establishing their independent governments, that all just governments "are founded on the 'inalienable right' of 'all men' to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,'" we affirm the absolute illegality of American slavery. We deny that it has any more legality in Georgia than in Massachusetts; that it is any more legal than the African slave-trade, or any other form of piracy and crime.

The object of this paper will be to unfold, explain, vindicate, and propagate these sentiments, calling on the people to maintain them at the ballot-box, thus providing for a federal legislature, a federal judiciary and a federal executive, that shall give them a national expression and force.

THE DUTIES OF ABOLITIONISTS AT THE COMING PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR,
Addressed more particularly to such Christian Abolitionists as believe in civil government, and hold to the Constitutional right and duty of the American Government to abolish American Slavery.

DEAR BRETHREN—I address you as abolitionists, because I do not expect any others to take any very deep interest in the subject of my letter—as Christian abolitionists, because I shall have occasion to appeal to Christian principles, and to urge Christian motives. And I have to do, mainly, at this time, with those of you who believe in civil government, and hold to the Constitutional right and duty of the Federal Government to suppress slavery in all the slave States. I have learned that some of you, notwithstanding that belief, have concluded to vote with the "Republican" party, for Col. J. C. Fremont, and that others of you are deliberating whether you will do so. I write for the purpose of presenting to you some considerations which, I think, ought to dissuade you from such a course, and I ask of you a patient and candid attention to such thoughts as I may offer.

In writing to you, with Christian fidelity, as I design to do, I shall be compelled to make use of plain language, and to say what my heart and conscience tell me I ought to say, though at the risk of giving offence to some of you. Yet I hope to write without transgressing the laws of Christian courtesy and kindness, or needlessly saying severe things. And I must entreat you not to mistake fidelity for unkindness. You will be almost certain to do this, if you allow yourselves to find fault with me for insisting earnestly that the question "For whom shall I vote?" is a question that should be decided in the light of moral principle and the rules of God's word, and not by human calculations of expediences and advantages. If I do not make this point clear to you, or if my application of it to the case in hand does not commend itself to

your sober and conscientious judgment, in the fear of God, then you are at liberty, of course, to reject my conclusions. But do not hastily pronounce me censorious or uncharitable merely on account of those conclusions, which may be unwelcome to you, nor because I frankly avow my belief in the principles that inevitably lead to them. It might perhaps be censorious and uncharitable in you to do so.

I. FIRST PRINCIPLES.

It is only in the light of first principles that the details of duty in the various relations of life—including political relations and duties—are to be determined. Those first principles are revealed to us by our Creator, both in our own moral natures (his divine workmanship) and in his written word. Among those relating to political life, I will mention some, to which, as Christians, as abolitionists, and as believers in civil government, you will doubtless yield your assent.

1. The equal brotherhood of all men—their equal and inalienable rights—and the consequent sinfulness of slaveholding.

2. The duty of loving our neighbors as ourselves, and doing to others as we would have others do to us.

3. The mutual obligation of mutual protection—of insisting upon the sacredness and the security of our neighbor's rights and liberties, as earnestly and as uncompromisingly as we would upon the security of our own, and of the rights and liberties of our own families.

4. The divine institution of civil government and civil law for these ends—the equal security and protection of the rights of all the inhabitants.

5. The supreme authority of God over the nations, including both the people and their rulers, enjoining upon them the organization, support, and impartial administration of civil government for these ends, under penalty of his disapprobation and providential chastisement, if not overthrow and destruction, for the neglect of this duty.

6. The individuality and personal responsibilities of men, in the midst of social relations and duties, forbidding each and every member of the community to consent to, or to participate in, the wrong-doing of his fellows, acting either as political parties, majorities, or civil rulers.

7. The unlawfulness and folly of violating God's commandments, running counter to his will, however revealed to us, (whether by the Bible, our own moral natures, or by the self-evident truths and principles which underlie positive precepts,) in order to produce what we may anticipate as beneficial results to ourselves or to others.

Christian abolitionists, if they believe in civil government, and undertake the discharge of political duties, could hardly desire, I should think, that, in the discussion of political questions, I should bring them to the test of a system of ethics less exacting and rigid than is embraced in these statements. Anything more lax, would undermine moral obligation, pervert law and government, corrupt politics, and render the defenses of liberty insecure.

You see I have mingled religion with politics, as I must needs do, unless I descend to the level of the atheistic politics under which the country now groans—which I cannot consent to do. The nation cannot afford, longer, to consent to it.

II. THE CASE STATED.

To the sunlight of these divine *principles*, let us next bring the *facts* which go to make up the case now requiring our attention. Our nation is deeply involved in the sin of oppression, the giant sin of slaveholding. As a people, we have been cherishing this sin for more than two centuries. As an independent nation, we have protected and nourished it for eighty years. We have been doing this under the full blaze of gospel light, amid sanctuaries and Bibles and Sabbaths, yet proscribing religious liberty, withholding the Bible, annulling marriage, and robbing the poor of their earnings. We have been doing this, while boasting of our free institutions, setting ourselves up as teachers of republicanism, and champions of inalienable human rights! Under a Constitution which not only permits but requires a national suppression of this national crime, we have been heaping up higher and still higher, our national guilt. Commencing our confederacy, eighty-two years ago, with a solemn promise to uproot the abomination, we are now wielding the matured powers of that same confederacy for its forcible extension. At every stage of this downward progress, has the nation been warned. And for the last quarter of a century has it been agitated with the warning. The duty, safety, and benefits of immediate emancipation have been demonstrated and acknowledged. The powers and the duty of the Federal Government to remove the incubus, are widely conceded. Divine Providences, unremitting, signal, and startling, have seconded these warnings. The work of Divine retribution, through the instrumentality of the cherished and idolized Despotism, has already begun. The long-tolerated oppressors of the *black* man have now commenced what they had before threatened, the subjugation of the *white* man. The outrages habitually committed upon southern slaves, are now being extended to northern freemen. In Kansas, and in the national Senate Chamber, the bowie knife and the bludgeon are beginning to be recognized as controlling powers. The prediction of Gov. McDuffie of South Carolina, in 1836, that slavery would be extended over the laboring population of the North within twenty-five years, appears to be in rapid process of fulfilment.

The North is, in some degree, roused to see this, is alarmed, and is taking an attitude of self-defence. But is it manifesting any signs of humiliation and repentance for the great national sin, on account of which Divine Providence is thus chastising us? Are the people,

with their statesmen and religious teachers, beginning to say among themselves, and to each other, "We are verily guilty concerning our brother"? "Let us *execute justice for the oppressed*, if, peradventure, the Lord may turn again, and have mercy upon us"? Do they, even with the sagacity common to worldly statesmen, discover the root of the mischief that afflicts them? Do they see in the very nature and existence of slavery, the natural and necessary cause of the aggressions against which they are indignant? Do they distinctly see that the only way to stop the aggressions and to remedy the evils of slavery, is to terminate the existence of slavery? Do they understand that the Constitution of the country contains no more securities for the personal freedom of white men than it does for the personal freedom of black men?

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Does the "Republican party" and its leaders recognise these elementary truths? Do they seek the deliverance of Kansas and of the country by professing to break the fetters of the *slave*, and thus—in the only practicable way—abolish the national oligarchy of *slaveholders*? Alas! No. The very reverse of all this is the fact. The Republican party is not a party for the deliverance of the enslaved, but only for the security of the free. It is not a party for the black man, but only for the white man. It is not a party for the rescue of the whole country from the despotism of the slave power, but only for the rescue of Kansas. It does not even dare to inscribe on its flag, the "free soil" motto of "No more slave states." It has nothing to say against the fugitive slave bill; nor against the continuance of slavery in the Federal District "under exclusive legislation of Congress." It proposes no abolition of the coast-wise and inland slave trade between the states. So far from repudiating all compromises with slavery, it is clamorous for the restoration and the sacredness of the wicked Missouri Compromise, the most corrupt and murderous of them all—a compromise almost unanimously condemned and abhorred at the North, when it was forced upon us.

In one word, "the Republican" party is *not* an association seeking deliverance from our great *national sin*. It is only a party waging indignant warfare against the instruments of the divine retribution inflicted upon us on account of that sin! Its grand object is to get rid of the *punishment* of transgression without putting away the transgression *itself*.

Is it acting the part of a Christian, of an abolitionist, of a philanthropist, of a patriot, or of a sagacious statesman, to join the ranks, to do the work, to fight under the flag, to espouse the principles of such a party? Does God require such a service of you? Can it be well pleasing to him who is the impartial Father of all men?

THE STATEMENT VINDICATED—FACTS—PITTSBURG CONVENTION—ITS NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

Can it be questioned, by any among you, whether I have given a fair and correct account of the position of the Republican party and its candidates? Allow me to refresh your memories with some documentary facts.

The "*Declaration of the principles and purposes of the Republican party*," as embodied in the "Address of the Republican Convention at

Pittsburg, Feb. 22, 1856," contained the following.

"We address to you this declaration of our principles and of the purposes which we seek to promote."

"The slaveholding interest cannot be made permanently *paramount* in the General Government, without involving consequences fatal to Free Institutions. We acknowledge that it is large and powerful, that in the States where it exists, it is entitled under the Constitution, like all other local interests, to immunity from the interferences of the General Government, and that it must necessarily exercise, through its representatives, a considerable share of political power. But there is nothing in its position, as there is certainly nothing in its character, to sustain the supremacy it seeks to establish."

"Disclaiming any intentions to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists, or to invalidate those portions of the Constitution by which it is removed from national control, let us prevent the increase of its political power, preserve the General Government from its ascendancy," &c. &c.

The President of this Convention was Francis Blair, a slaveholder of Maryland, who read an elaborate paper, proposing, as he himself stated, 'the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, for the security of the slave institution,' a mutual compromise, "*the finale of all existing commotions*."

This paper, with the speech that accompanied it, was received by the Convention, "*with unbounded applause*," and measures were taken to call another Convention, to nominate candidates to carry out their declared principles and measures.

On the basis of the proceedings of this Convention, and by a call from its Committee, delegates were chosen to attend the Nominating Convention which was to be held at Philadelphia in June. *None others were invited or would have been eligible to seats there.* The "Call" of the Committee, explicitly specified the object to be "the restoration of the Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson"—(under whose administrations, the first fugitive slave bill was enacted, the Slave Code confirmed over the Federal District, new Slave States added, and slave territory acquired by purchase.)

And lest this should not be sufficiently explicit, the Committee followed up the "Call" with an elaborate *Address*, setting forth the objects of the Nominating Convention about to be held, which were thus stated—

"Why may not all those classes who are hostile to the introduction of slavery into free territory, unite at this crisis of impending danger, to vote for a common ticket, which will be nominated to assert the grand principle of repressing the extension of slaveholding monopoly, and vindicate the rights of the people in all sections of the Union, who labor with their own hands? A ticket which will agitate NOT with a view to detract from the rights of the States to dispose of the subject within their limits, according to their sovereign will: yet its influence to destroy the freedom of WHITE laborers is, a fit subject of investigation (!?) with a view to repress the aggressive power in every constitutional way."

Again, speaking of their Democratic opponents, the Committee say,

"In their arrogance they stigmatise as 'black republicans' those who would make a constellation of free bright republics, constituted of the WHITE race ALONE, untarnished by a slave of any color."

THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION—ITS PLATFORM.

Upon this platform, as laid down for it, before-hand, the Nominating Convention assembled at Philadelphia the 17th of June. The

members were delegated to nominate a President *on this platform*. The very fact of assembling under these circumstances was an expression of their approbation of the platform, unless they should do something, when assembled, to repudiate it.

But they did nothing of the kind. They did nothing, at the Philadelphia Convention, that was not perfectly consistent with the doings of the Pittsburg Convention. In substance, they repeated, though in less offensive language, the main principle of the Pittsburg Convention.—They did this by adverting to the “self-evident truths” of the Declaration of Independence, and then adding that “the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government were to secure these rights to all persons *under their exclusive jurisdiction*,” meaning, in the Territories, and plainly suggesting that the Government was *not* to apply the same principle within the States! They did this, still further, by quoting the Constitutional provision that “no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law,”—and then saying, “It becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it in the *Territories* of the United States!—thus plainly teaching that its violation in the States was to be passed over with impunity. So that the Declaration of Independence made by the “Representatives of the United States,” and the “Constitution of the United States”—so far as the principles and the safeguards of liberty are concerned—are not at all for the States, who declared and ordained them, but for “the Territories” only!

I am not aware that any National Convention of any political party, has ever gone farther than this, in promulgating and carrying out the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution, so far as “the United States” are concerned. The present Administration proceeds only one step farther, by the very consistent application of the same exposition to the Territories also.

SELECTION OF THE CANDIDATE.

But the Philadelphia Convention did not leave the matter here. In the selection of their Presidential Candidate they *deliberately placed themselves on precisely the same platform* with the Pittsburg Convention. Col. Fremont, for the first time, and “without political antecedents,” (as we are told,) is introduced to the notice of the Convention. His political creed is inquired after, and is produced, by his friends, in the words following—

“While I am inflexible in the belief that it [slavery] ought not to be interfered with where it exists, *under the shield of State sovereignty*, I am as inflexibly opposed to its extension beyond its present limits.”

This was a repetition of the Pittsburg Platform in almost the same words, and equally explicit and strong. The Letter containing it was greeted with acclamations. On this profession of his faith, Col. Fremont is received into the brotherhood of the “Republican” party, and is nominated its leader.

LEADING REPUBLICAN JOURNALS.

I have been thus particular, because it is alleged by some, that the Convention at Philadelphia and its candidate, do not stand on the same ground with the Convention at Pittsburg. But this is not alleged by any of the leading

Republican Editors, nor in any speeches or Resolutions of their Conventions. In reply to the slanders of the Democrats who charge them with affinities for abolition, they appeal to *both* their Pittsburg and their Philadelphia documents, making no distinction between them, and adhering to both, alike.

As the campaign goes forward, these declarations accumulate and become more and more emphatic. It would be easy to glean from their journals, all over the country, a large volume of their disclaimers of any sympathy with the slaves, or any inclination to disturb slavery. In denying that Col. Fremont is a slaveholder, Horace Greeley, of the New York Tribune, scouts the idea that it would be any valid objection against voting for him, if he *were* a slaveholder. He adds—(addressing his correspondent) “Do not you and I recognise the legal right to hold slaves in the slave States?”—And this goes the rounds of the Fremont journals without disapproval. Yet Mr. Greeley had said, a few months previous, that “there must always be law enough, in a republic, to sweep away Slavery, when the Judges can afford to discern and apply it.” The demoralizing effect of supporting the candidate of the Republican platform is here plainly seen, and Mr. Greeley is not the only instance that might be mentioned.

The New York Times, edited by Lieut. Gov. Raymond, who wrote the Address of the Pittsburg Convention, declares that Col. Fremont’s vote in the Senate against abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, “was precisely what it should be”—that such action “is not a measure advocated by the Republican party”—and that it “proves conclusively, the conservative and defensive character of the Republican movement.”

The New York Independent, though admitting the right of Congress to abolish slavery in the District, does not censure Col. Fremont for his vote against that measure. It maintains that “Congress has no right to interfere with slavery where it exists under State sovereignty.” Hence it “likes exceedingly, the discrimination of Col. Fremont’s position. It is wise, sound, and constitutional.”

The National Era (of Aug. 21st) under the head of “*Impracticables*,” opposes the views of Radical Abolitionists respecting the Constitutional power of the National Government to abolish slavery in the States. It not only denies the fact of such Constitutional power, but maintains that there ought to be none. It says,

“It would, at once, abolish every vestige of state independence and state sovereignty. The abolition of slavery, even, would be dearly purchased at the price of our system of confederated government.” . . . “We would not sacrifice the Federal Constitution and the independence of the states to secure its immediate abolition.” . . . “The Federal principle is as essential to the maintenance of liberty as the habeas corpus and jury trial.” . . . “It [the Constitution] secures to the several states the absolute control of their domestic affairs, slavery as well as the rest, and to trample on it, in the name of Freedom is to set an example to tyrants.” . . . “The Republican party can take no such ground.”

So then, the power of the States to chattelize the people of the United States is essential to “State independence” and “State sovereignty”—“as essential to the maintenance of liberty as the habeas corpus and jury trial!” How far

does this fall short of making “slavery the corner stone of our republican edifice”?

I have now quoted from four of the most talented, most respectable, most widely circulated, and most influential journals sustaining the Republican party. I give them as fair average specimens of the Republican press. The New York Herald, the Connecticut Courant, and some others, are much worse. The Herald openly proposes the admission of Kansas as a slave State. But I will leave such papers out of the account, though their influence on the Republican ranks cannot be small.

A party is supposed to be represented by its leading and best-sustained presses. If the majority of the Republican party, or if any particular members of it, are not truthfully represented by its platform, its documents, its principal speakers, its best patronized Editors, its *Presidential candidate*, whom they support, then the majority of the Republican party, or those particular members of it, are bestowing their patronage, exerting their influence, and preparing to cast their votes in opposition to their own convictions. I think there is no escaping from this conclusion. If the remark should seem to bear heavily upon any of you, my friends, to whom I am now writing, I hope you will see that the fault is not mine, but should be charged upon your own false position.

THE ABOLITION PARTY.

I have described the Republican party. But there is another party opposed to the reigning Administration party. It is the Abolition party. Its position is soon stated. It is older than the “Republican” party. Its candidates were earliest nominated. Its principles are *your* professed principles. Its measures, in perfect harmony with its principles, are the measures which *you* profess to advocate—and which, you say, *ought* to be adopted by the people and their rulers. This party goes for the equal and impartial protection of all men, of all colors and conditions, in all parts of the country. It holds—and you agree with it—that the National Government has full authority and power, under the Constitution, to protect the personal rights and liberties of each and all of “the people of the United States,” and that it is morally and politically bound to do so. This party holds—and you agree with it, that the exercise of this power by the National Government, would remove slavery and all its aggressions and evils—that it would secure freedom to Kansas, restore peace and order, preserve the Union, and promote the prosperity of the whole country, North and South, East and West, without any violation of the Constitution or of vested rights, without doing any injury to a single citizen or inhabitant. In a word, you have no fault to find with the principles of the Abolition party or its measures.—You consider them to be in accordance with the will of God. In the conscientious exercise of your best judgment, you believe them to be precisely what they ought to be. It is your daily prayer that they may all be fully realized. Your testimony, your influence, and (perhaps, to some extent) your pecuniary contributions, you claim to be, and to have been, in their favor.

You will not—you cannot say this—in respect to the Republican party, in the particulars

wherein, as already shown, it is in opposition to the Abolition party. Those features of it you condemn, as *not* being in accordance with God's will.

And you make no objections against the candidates of the Abolition party. You say you greatly prefer them to those of the Republican party. The Presidential candidate of the Abolitionists, (unlike Col. Fremont,) has, for more than twenty years past, been known to all of you, to the whole country, and to the world, as one of the most able, most eloquent, most devoted, most munificent advocates of universal liberty, that this or any other age has yet produced. You are forward, all of you, with scarce a solitary exception, to say that if you believed your vote would elect him, it would be eagerly given.

On another important point, you will agree with me, as well as with the platform and documents of the Abolition party. You believe and maintain that the duty of the *Government* of the United States, in respect to slavery, is the duty of the *PEOPLE* of the United States in respect to slavery.

And, (as I have said before,) you will, I think, agree with me, substantially, in the statement of "First Principles" which I made, in the beginning.

III. THE ISSUE STATED AND EXAMINED.

Now then, with these *facts* of the case fairly and fully before us, a statement of the issue between us may be clearly and readily made.

The one simple question is this: Can it be right, in the sight of God, is it in accordance with his will, that you should vote for Col. Fremont, and for an administration of the National Government by him, in connexion with the Republican party, and its leading men, as some of you are proposing to do?

I know it is not common, even among Christians, and by Christian ministers, to put political questions into this shape, but I maintain that it is the very shape in which they always ought to be put, and that *political wisdom*, equally with Christian fidelity, requires that they be pondered and decided in this aspect, and by this test. Whatever course is in accordance with *God's will*, is safe, and no other course can be, in the long run, however confidently pursued, however unanimously adopted, however successfully consummated.

EXAMINATION IN THE LIGHT OF FIRST PRINCIPLES.

Referring, now, to the "First Principles" which we laid down in the beginning, I ask you to compare the platform of the Republican party and its Presidential candidate with those principles, and see whether they agree or disagree with each other, and whether it would be right or wrong for you to help elect an administration of the National Government to be conducted on that platform?

1. That administration, if it comes into power, will come in, pledged in advance *not* "to interfere with slavery in the states where it exists," thus refusing to wield the Constitutional powers of the National Government for the relief of three and a half million of our fellow-citizens, constitutionally entitled to liberation and protection.

Will such an administration, and the vote that creates it, be in accordance with the equal brotherhood of all men? Will it honor that

equality? Will it fulfil the demands of that brotherhood? Will it be "remembering them that are in bonds, as bound with them"? Will it vindicate and secure their inalienable rights? Will it not rather be a refusal to vindicate and secure them? Will it be a testimony against the sinfulness of slaveholding? Will it not rather be a testimony in favor of its innocence? Or else, will it not be granting four years' impunity to known crime—the giant crime of our nation? You believe in the duty of immediate abolition. Will this be acting in accordance with your belief?

2. Will it be loving your neighbors as yourselves? Will it be doing to others, as you would have others to do to you? If you were, yourself a slave, in one of the slave states, and were it possible for you to put such a vote into the ballot-box, do you think you would put it there? A vote to have the National Government let slavery alone in the States, for four years longer? Would you? Or would you, if you were a Georgia slave, be pleased and gratified to hear that all your professed friends at the North, were voting in this manner? Would the excuses that now satisfy you, satisfy you then?

Remember that very nearly all the slaves in the country are slaves in the States—and that the Republican party and its candidate do not propose to liberate any slave, *any where*, either in the District of Columbia or in the Territories, including even Kansas. On the other hand, the House of Representatives, very few of the "Republicans" dissenting, have just passed a Bill for the Pacification of Kansas, which specially admits that slavery can exist in the Territories, that slaves can be born there, and provides for taking them away, under the present Fugitive Slave Bill!

Imagine yourself a fugitive slave, and so situated as to have an opportunity of voting either for Gerrit Smith or for Col. Fremont—which would you vote for? Would you vote for any one not pledged for the immediate repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill? Imagine your wife, child, brother, or sister, in slavery, or escaping from it, and how would you vote?

3. Can you discharge towards the slave and the fugitive the mutual obligation of mutual protection, while you vote to let slavery alone in the States for at least four years?

4. Can you honor the divine institution of civil government and civil law, while voting for an administration that will refuse, for four years, (the full term of its existence,) to do the work of civil government and law, in respect to one-sixth part of the inhabitants?

5. Can you honor the supreme authority of God over the nation, the people and the rulers, by voting for rulers who pledge themselves in advance, *not* to obey God's commandments to be a terror to evil doers, a protector of the innocent, the refuge of the oppressed, the helper of the helpless—*not* to "execute judgment"—*not* to "deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor"—*not* to "proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof"—*not* to do it now, "in the morning"—early, timely, without delay? Can it be that any one who fears God, who loves liberty and who hates oppression, can hesitate, on so plain a question as this?

6. In view of your own individuality of existence and personal responsibility to your Creator and final Judge, can you justly excuse yourself for voting to elect an administration pledged beforehand to disobey his divine commandments, on the ground that since you cannot elect an administration alone, but must needs act with others, you must therefore lower down the moral quality of *your* vote, so as to make it agree with the standard of those around you, whether it comes up to God's requirements or no? Will you thus "follow a multitude to do evil," and strengthen the hands of an administration that is pledged to disobey God, by refusing to do the *main work* which God has committed to civil rulers?

7. In view of God's explicit commandments which are clearly seen to harmonize with the necessities of man, the nature of civil government, and the demands of moral rectitude, can you deem it either wise or innocent to vote for an administration that—if elected at all—will be elected in consequence of its pledging itself, beforehand, *not* to do justice to the millions of their subjects who most need it? And can you do this, on the plea and with the hope that by this act of disobedience, you can help to produce a better state of things than could have resulted from your obedience—or that you can help to prevent evils and avert divine judgments that are, otherwise, to be apprehended?

EXAMINATION BY THE RULES OF GOD'S WORD— GOD'S LAW OF POLITICAL ACTION.

To every civil ruler, to every civil government, to every administration of civil government, and to every people who choose their ruler—yea, to each and to every one of them, God says,

"Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings," Jer. xxi. 12. "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof," Lev. xxv. 10.

This is God's "platform" of the duties of an administration—his definition of a just ruler—his definition of the responsibilities of a voter. It says nothing about limiting the work of oppression, or preventing its extension. It demands deliverance for all the oppressed.

"The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me. He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds, as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining, after rain," 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, 4.

Such are the rulers, and such only, to whom, with their constituents who sustain them, God promises security and prosperity, instead of destruction and overthrow. And the vote is to be cast upon that "platform."

"Judges and officers, shalt thou make thee in all the gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes, and they shall judge the people with just judgment," Deut. xvi. 18.

"Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you," Deut. 1. 16.

Both these commands were addressed, as the connection will show, to the people of Israel, for their guidance in the choice of their rulers. And the same principle applies to all voting citizens

now. They are required to choose all their rulers, in all their country, to the intent that they may "judge the people" (*all of them*), "with just judgment." This is a plain prohibition against voting for rulers pledged, beforehand, not to "judge—with just judgment"—three and a half millions of "the people"—but to leave them at the mercy of their oppressors! No man can cast such a vote without a palpable violation of this express precept. Still further, for the guidance of the citizen in this duty, the vote must be cast for "wise men and understanding;" that is, well instructed and well informed in respect to their duties as civil rulers, according to the Divine Platform, and "known among" the great mass of the people for these qualifications—not for their military prowess, nor for the skill, tact, strategy, and obsequiousness with which they can assist in the conquest of a defenseless and innocent people, in an unjust and aggressive war, waged for the purpose of extending the area of slavery, under the administration of wicked rulers. Common sense and a single eye, even without texts of scripture, ought to be sufficient to deter citizens from voting for such candidates, under the plea of its being necessary to prevent the further extension of slavery, or for the protection of the innocent and defenseless, who are crushed or left defenseless by the same class of wicked rulers!

IV. EXCUSES AND OBJECTIONS.

I now come to a consideration of some of the chief pleas and excuses that are made for such a course of action. They will all be found, on examination, to have been based, either upon false assumptions, upon false principles, or upon palpable deviations from the demands of moral principle, on the pleas of present availability and temporary expediency.

FALSE ASSUMPTIONS.

It is constantly assumed that the facts of the case are different from what I have stated and proved them to be.

1. It is assumed that "the Philadelphia platform is an immense improvement on the Pittsburg manifesto," (vide Free Presbyterian.) I have shown that they are identical—that the Presidential candidate is strongly committed to the worst feature of the "Pittsburg manifesto," which has never been repealed or repudiated, but is still appealed to by the leaders of the party as containing their platform.

2. It is persistently assumed that "the greatest difficulty" in the way of an abolitionist's voting for Fremont, is the fact that the candidates have not declared, and do not declare any purpose to abolish slavery by legislation, in the States," (vide Frederick Douglass's paper.)

No! "The greatest difficulty is, that they have pledged themselves *against* it!" The other difficulty is indeed a formidable one. What right have I to vote for candidates not "known" among all the people as strenuous advocates of 'breaking every yoke, and letting the oppressed go free,' according to God's commandments?

3. It is assumed that "the Republicans propose to *begin* the work of abolition, and do a part of it." But this is not true. Their leading journals are constantly disclaiming anything of the kind, and repelling the imputation of it as a slander.

VOTING WITH "REPUBLICANS" TO SAVE KANSAS.

4. It is assumed that by the election of the "Republican" candidates we could certainly secure liberty for Kansas. But this is very far from being certain, or even probable. *That* question is most likely to be determined in another manner, and before a new President comes into power. The action of the "Republicans" in the House, in adopting Mr. Dunn's Kansas Pacification Bill, with its explicit recognition of the present legality of slavery in Kansas, (in the absence of even positive law—except that of the Bogus Legislature!) does not look much like "Republican" competency to secure freedom in Kansas! Col. Fremont's Letter of acceptance, carefully examined, does not bind him to *that* particular measure. It says that "the extension of slavery across the Continent is the object of the power which now rules the Government; and" (that) "from this sprung the . . . wrongs in Kansas." Distinctly "declining to pledge himself to any particular policy that has been suggested to terminate the sectional controversy," (the *main* object,) the Letter proceeds to suggest that "a practical remedy is the admission of Kansas into the Union as a Free State," and that "the South," (in the writer's judgment,) "should earnestly desire such consummation." But suppose "the South" persists in thinking otherwise? Suppose "the sectional controversy" cannot be "terminated" in that manner? Will Col. Fremont—so intent on "terminating" that "sectional controversy"—persist in resolutely demanding freedom for Kansas; and thus aggravate that "sectional controversy"? *Will he?* He does not say so! But what does he say? He only says, "If the People entrust to me the administration of the Government, the laws of Congress in relation to the Territories shall be faithfully executed." This is all he promises in respect to Kansas. No Presidential candidate could decently refuse to say thus much. And thus much Col. Fremont, if elected President, might do, to the letter—and yet, under certain circumstances, very likely to occur, might sign a bill for the admission of Kansas as a slave State. His promise might even require him to do so. Suppose under "a law of Congress in relation" to Kansas, another Convention should be held for the forming of a State Constitution—and it is by no means impossible that a "Republican" Congress should do this. Then suppose, in some way or other, the new Constitution, thus formed, should admit slavery. Is it quite certain that a Republican Congress that had admitted, before hand, the legality of slavery in Kansas, (having always admitted its legality in the slave States,) would be able to refuse the admission of Kansas as a slave State? From *their* theory of the Constitution, as allowing slavery in the States, could they infer the disability of the "State" of Kansas to claim and exercise the same sort of "State Rights"? Does the history of debates and votes in Congress, for the last three or four years, warrant us in believing that they could? Talk of "back-bone"! What can even a "back-bone" do without either lever, fulcrum, or ground to stand upon? Your President Fremont, if elected, might possibly find himself bound, by his Letter of Acceptance, not to veto a bill for the admission of Kansas as a

slave State. That Letter of Acceptance has been greatly commended for the conservative care and sagacity with which it was drawn. I will not say that it was shaped in reference to such a very probable contingency as the one that I have described. But I will say that if it was, it could not have been more skilfully drawn. I will say, further, that if Col. Fremont, acting as President, should sign such a bill, he will have violated no pledge in his Letter of Acceptance—and that Letter will be his sufficient defence from any charge of apostasy or treachery that any abolitionist or "friend-of-freedom-in-Kansas" could then bring against him.

This is not saying that Col. Fremont and his party do not desire freedom in Kansas, and that they would not, if successful in this election, exert themselves to make Kansas a free State, as strenuously and as wisely as they can, with the views they hold of Federal and State rights, of the legality of slavery, and their exposition of Constitutional law. But it is saying that no "Radical Abolitionist" has any reason to suppose that they could be depended upon for such a service. It would be a defence with pop-guns against heavy artillery. The strongest men are powerless when they cast off the panoply of Truth. Mere resolution in favor of "freedom-in-Kansas" will not *secure* it.

While I am writing, another unexpected development shows the folly of trusting in the Republican party to "save Kansas." The Republican members of the House succeeded, for a long time, in preventing the passage of the Army Bill, unless accompanied with a proviso that the National forces should not be employed in enforcing the Slave Code imposed by the border ruffians upon Kansas. It was confidently believed that, in this way, the President's power to "crush out" freedom in Kansas might be checked. But at length it was evident, from the tone of the Republican press generally, that there was a great panic in the Republican ranks, lest a refusal to pass the Army bill (which measure was denounced as Revolutionary) would prejudice the election of Col. Fremont! A greater blunder was never made. A firm stand maintained in the House would have inspired fresh confidence in the masses. But, all at once, the Army bill, without the proviso, was suffered to pass the House. How did it happen? The Washington correspondent of the New York Herald, a leading Fremont Journal, (Aug. 31) lays the blame to the Republicans themselves. He says—

"Letters had been received from Greeley and others, begging the Republicans to change their tactics, as their course was ruining them at home. In one letter Greeley says, 'For God's sake let the bill pass.' And assurances were given to democrats that the bill should pass, if they would play their cards right.—When the result was announced, a general congratulation prevailed over the House, the Republicans, if possible, showing the greatest joy.' 'The Republicans could, if they had chosen, have killed the bill. Messrs. Walsh of Connecticut, Milward of Pennsylvania, Miller of New York, with Speaker Banks, would have defeated it, but they were evidently anxious it should pass."

And what says Mr. Greeley in reply? In general terms, that "the statement is not according to truth," but he does not deny having written the letter! Instead of meeting the char of having *passed* the bill, he labors to

ward off the charge, (which had not been made) of being responsible for the suspense or delay of it.

"It was the fault of the Buchanan and Fillmore men, who went off, prematurely, that this result was not attained, days ago." . . . "We are content with the issue as made by the Senate, and, since the passage of the House proviso was impossible, we were and are, ready to go at once to the people. Hence we were willing to see the Appropriation Bill carried over the heads of the Republicans, and the session brought to a close." "The Republicans, being a minority of the House, could not prevent the ultimate passage of the bill without the proviso."

This seems like an apology for the letter described in the Herald. The policy is sufficiently evident. Since the mountain would not come to Mahomet, at his bidding, Mahomet could go to the mountain. The doctrine that reformatory minorities must so shape their course as to fall in with majorities, finds characteristic illustration, here. Mr. Greeley does not deny that the Republicans, at that time, might have defeated the bill. The future was in the hands of Providence. Slender reeds for poor Kansas to lean upon. Sad would it be, if Kansas should be sacrificed to promote the election of Fremont!

SUPPOSED PRECEDENTS.

5. It is assumed that "the Republican party stands where the Liberty party formerly stood." This statement, if true, could not justify our taking a wrong position, now, because we formerly did so, when less correctly informed. If it might excuse those who now know no better, it does not excuse "Radical Abolitionists," who do know better. We are bound to walk in the light of our present knowledge, not in the darkness of our former ignorance, nor of the present ignorance of others.

But the assumption is unfounded. There has been no time when the Liberty party confined its efforts to the non extension of slavery. It always demanded the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery in all the Territories, and in the District of Columbia, as well as the prohibition of the slave trade between the States, and it always went against the admission of new slave States. These measures the two Republican Conventions declined adopting.—Their leading journals and orators continually disclaim the imputation of these designs as an aspersion, a reproach, a slander.

6. It is assumed that, although there was no foundation for the abolitionists to vote for the Whigs, or for the Free Soilers, and it was wrong and foolish for them to do so, yet the position of the Republicans is so much in advance of those parties, and they are so rapidly rising in their tone of sentiment, that the case is altogether a different one, and more hopeful. The exact reverse of all this is the truth. The Whigs obtained the votes of abolitionists only by professing to be in favor of their measures, (such as those above stated) soliciting the votes of abolitionists, and claiming to be abolitionists themselves. The "Republican" party, on the other hand, refuses to adopt our measures—is careful not to prejudice its interests nor soil its reputation by soliciting our co-operation or our votes—disclaims all affinity with us and sympathy for the slaves—and repels the suspicion or abolitionism as a slander. The Free Soil party also solicited our votes adopted some of our

measures, and opposed the Fugitive Slave bill, which the Republican party declines doing. In every respect, the Republican party maintains a far lower standard than any of its predecessors that have heretofore received anti-slavery votes.

It can hardly be said that the Republican platform differs materially from the twin Baltimore platforms of Pierce and Scott, before the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Its one object has been repeatedly stated, by its leading friends, to be the restoration of that Compromise, which would place the country precisely where it stood at the date of the twin Baltimore platforms, reposing on the "Compromise measure of 1850," Fugitive Slave bill and all. So careful were the late Pittsburg and Philadelphia Republican Conventions to avoid the appearance of going beyond the "Compromise Platform of 1856," that the old Free Soil flag of 'No more Slave States,' was deliberately and persistently hauled down, because, as was alleged, the "Compromise" of 1850 had provided for the contingency of admitting new Slave States formed out of Texas. For these and similar reasons, a large portion of the Free Soil editors and leaders were backward to come into the Republican movement, and did so with reluctance, as their utterances attest. Abolitionists never before consented to vote on so low a standard. Had any one predicted it, a few years ago, it would not have been believed. The "Republican" party is the only party receiving anti-slavery votes, yet making a merit of its tendency and its object to put the anti-slavery agitation at rest—and that, too, without proposing to liberate a single slave.

NATURE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF VOTING.

7. It is assumed that a vote for a Presidential candidate is not a vote for the main principles, measures, and disclaimers of measures, on the avowal of which he was nominated, and to which he still adheres! It is assumed that a vote for the Presidential candidate of a National Convention is not a vote for the Platform of that Convention, which sets forth its principles, its disclaimers, its measures, and its objects—to all which the candidate responds, assents, and adheres. It is assumed that at least, by "voting under protest," if in no other way, the responsibility of the voter for such principles, disclaimers and measures, may be avoided, neutralized, or turned aside.

"I care nothing about the Platform of the Convention," says one. "The Convention had no authority to speak for me. I know what I mean by my own vote. They may mean what they please. It is no concern of mine." And "I care nothing for the utterances of the candidates," says the same or another voter. "I think I know what the party, the body or majority of voters, will do, and they will control the Administration, when it comes into power." "And I care nothing about the aims or principles of the party," says a third, (or perhaps the same person,) "I can't be responsible for all who may vote the same ticket with me, nor for the majority of them. I vote for the good which I mean to accomplish by it, and the bad I have nothing to do with." "Caring nothing" about the Convention, the candidate, or the party, and repudiating the open declarations of all of them, the voter is nevertheless determined to vote for them and with them.

'And so they wrap (or snarl) it up.' (Micah vii. 3. Thus they cover over and entangle themselves and their doings. Thus they think to escape the responsibility of their own acts.—Thus they trifle with their most solemn duties. Thus they set aside God's plainest commandments. Thus they nevertheless reveal their struggles with their own convictions. Men never resort, for shelter to such excuses, unless their exigencies require it. Is this the language of needless severity? Look, I pray you, at the facts attested by such excuses. The voter dare not avow the aims and sentiments avowed by his candidate, and on the merit of which he received his nomination, and on account of which he expects to be elected. And yet he will vote for him. And he "cares nothing about the Platform"—nothing about the Nominating Convention—nothing about the party with which he is acting. But—my friend, if you do not care for it, the millions of your enslaved brothers and sisters do care for it.—Christ, their elder brother, cares for it. The Holy Spirit, whose temple some of them are, cares for it. And God, the Father of us all, cares for it. You, too, will care for it, in a coming day. "Be not deceived. God is not mocked. Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." If he sows a vote to let alone the fetters of millions of his brothers and sisters for four years longer, (thrice as long, perhaps, as he, himself, may live,) that vote shall he reap when he stands before his Maker in judgment. "Little children, let no man deceive you. He that doeth righteousness is righteous." Nor he that proposes to do righteousness, four years hence, and on the fancied merit of it, emboldens himself to join with others, in doing unrighteousness, now. Who has assured you that you shall live four years longer, to undo by a righteous vote, then, what you are doing by an unrighteous vote, now? Or how do you know that you should have a heart to do it, if you should live four years longer?

TRY THE RULE, ON THE OTHER SIDE!

Imagine your political opponents making the same plea you are making, and see what you would then think of it. Here is a Democrat, with the Platform of the Cincinnati Convention and Buchanan's Letter of Acceptance, both before him. He reads them, and tells you that he intends to vote for Buchanan. You tell him his vote will be a vote against freedom in Kansas—a vote for the Bogus Legislature, and for the Border Ruffians. "Oh no," says he, "I vote for neither of them. I only vote for some other things in the Platform which are good." And so he repeats over to you the same pleas by which you think to prove that you can vote for Fremont and the Republican party, without voting chains upon millions of your fellow-men. What would you think of him? What would you say to him? How could you condemn him, without condemning yourself? Will God absolve you from the blame of voting against the freedom of three and a half millions of colored men, while he condemns your neighbour for doing the same thing, or for adding to that sin the kindred sin, on a smaller scale, of voting against the liberties of an indefinitely smaller number of white men in Kansas?

No! It is all folly and self-deception. The chief sin of the Democratic party is its continu-

ous refusal to liberate the enslaved Americans in the Slave States. The attempt at "crushing out liberty in Kansas," is but a sin of yesterday, an incident, merely, an instrument of its greater and more chronic and long continued sin. The "Republican" party is "inflexibly opposed" to any disturbance of that great sin. Such disturbance would be "fatal to liberty," by overturning the sacred and sovereign right of the States to maintain Slavery! It thus endorses the *chief* sin of the Democratic party, and becomes a partaker in it. It claims, however, the merit of supporting *white* liberty in Kansas. The sin of voting for black Slavery in the States is cancelled by the merit of voting for white liberty in Kansas!

APPLY YOUR RULE TO YOUR OWN VOTING.

You say your vote for the "Republican" candidate is not a vote for his pledge, and for the pledge of the convention against liberating the American slaves.—Well then. How can you say that your vote for the candidate, and with the Convention and party is a vote against slavery in Kansas? If it be not a vote for the former, how can it be a vote for the latter? If you shirk the blame of the one, how can you receive approbation for the other? How can you prevent the influence of your vote in the one direction, and yet secure its influence in the other? The same vote that elects the national deliverer, as you suppose, of the whites in Kansas, elects the man "inflexibly opposed" to the national deliverance of millions of colored men in the States. If your vote cannot be trusted to tell what you intend with respect to colored men in the States, how can it be trusted to tell what you intend in respect to white men in Kansas?

And why may not Bennett, of the N. Y. Herald, and his wing of the Republican party say that *their* vote is *not* a vote for freedom in Kansas, (as already they *do* say it is not,) but only a vote to hush up agitation on the 'nigger question,' and use up the 'nigger worshippers,' as they call them, with their own votes? In such a co-partnership, which side, do you think, would be most likely to get cheated? Let past experiments in that line be pondered.

VOTING UNDER PROTEST.

But the vote, it is said, is made "under protest"! And pray, what can that mean?—Against what, or against whom, is the protest made? Is it against the pledge to let Slavery alone in the States? Is it against the candidate and the Convention who made the pledge? How then can the vote be given in their favor? The vote protests that it is all wrong; but his vote conveys the power of perpetrating that wrong! If there be any power in the protest, the voter protests against himself! He declares his knowledge of the wrong, while he knowingly assists in its infliction. He does know—he can't help knowing, that his vote helps to continue the wrong in the Platform, just as much as it can help the right in the Platform.

The device of "voting under protest," is among the most modern, and least creditable, of our American inventions. Its first experiment, if I mistake not, was made in 1852, when Whigs and Democrats, alike, voted for Scott, or for Pierce "under protest" against their twin Baltimore platforms. The pretense was derided

by Free Soilers and Abolitionists, as it deserved to be, till the inventors were ashamed of it, and cast it aside. But the tattered old cloak is now being brushed up again by abolitionists intent on voting with the Republicans! It is of no use to think of reforming our corrupt politics, if the last and most shameless of all political devices is to be adopted by political reformers. As well might they proclaim upon the house tops that sincerity and honesty in politics are "impracticable." Your vote is yourself—part and parcel of that self that must go to the bar of judgment. Do you deem this too "radical?" Then listen to the "Republican" Editor of the N. Y. Independent.

WHAT IS MY VOTE?

"It is my sovereignty, whereby, so far as in me lies I decree what shall be the laws and institutions, the policy and destiny of the State. It is my revelation to the world of my principles and wishes as a citizen. It is my testimony for the right or the wrong in society and in government. It is my vicegerency, wherein as one invested by God with the function of ruling, I prove my character as a faithful or an unfaithful steward; it is a power for good or for evil for which I am personally responsible to God. To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

The teachings of the Word of God upon the duties and responsibilities of rulers, apply emphatically to us who choose our rulers, who make our own laws and rule ourselves by men of our election. The egotism of Louis XIX. was concentrated in the boast, "I am the State;" France exists for me. But duty and responsibility should fasten upon every citizen here, the conviction, *I am the State*; its officers are mine; its laws are mine; its acts are mine;—and I must answer before God for what do I or omit to do in the State, as well as for what I do or omit to do in the family and in the church.

That little folded paper, that no human eye may read as you cast it into the unpretending box, is read of God, as a witness of your use or abuse of one of the most solemn trusts He has committed to your care. There is a judge of the election, whom we do not appoint; there is a check-list that we do not see and cannot falsify. And surely as there is a record in heaven, surely as God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, so surely must we meet hereafter our votes recorded there as for or against the cause of virtue, of freedom, of truth and of righteousness.

Let us go then to the polls under the eye of God. *If party banners have enrolled upon them any name or deed of wickedness, let us refuse to march under them.* If the multitude are pressing on to do evil, if the votaries of oppression are clamorous for candidates pledged to consummate iniquity, *let us not go with them*; but as men having a conscience to satisfy, a duty to perform, a God to meet, let us do this high and solemn act of sovereignty.—N. Y. Independent, Aug. 14.

I think no Radical Abolitionist, believing in the National duty of protecting the liberties of the entire Nation, can agree with this truly Christian sentiment, and yet justify his voting with the Republican party.

V. FALSE PRINCIPLES.—FURTHER EXCUSES.

False principles are intertwined with the false assumptions and fictitious facts already considered—particularly in the assumption that the voter votes for the candidate without endorsing either his principles or his measures.

But I come now to a more distinct consideration of some of the false principles that underlie or that constitute the excuses and objections with which I am dealing.

1. HAVE PRINCIPLES ANY BINDING AUTHORITY?

It is useless to lay down correct principles of action, or to expose false principles, unless it be first understood and settled whether correct principles have any binding authority. Nearly all the excuses of professed abolitionists for voting with the "Republicans" go on the assumption, directly or indirectly, that correct principles have no binding authority. Nearly all the

letters I receive from such abolitionists, nearly all the printed apologies that come from them, nearly all the verbal explanations that reach my ears from them, embrace, or imply, in some form, that leading idea. Without exception, they all claim to agree with Radical Abolitionists, in their principles, while they only disagree with them in respect to their measures, which grow out of their principles.

"The difference between our paper of this week and our paper of last week, is a difference of policy, not of principle." "Hereafter we shall contend for every principle and maintain every doctrine, laid down in the platform of the Radical Abolitionist." *Frederick Douglass.*

"In supporting this nomination we suspend rather than compromise our peculiar views." "We support Mr. Fremont under protest."—*True American.*

"The difference between us and our Radical Abolition Friends, is one of policy, and not of principle." *Free Presbyterian.*

"I believe, with Gerrit Smith and William Goodell, that there is not a slave legally held in the Union, but then, we could not, perhaps, in twenty years, elect a man on that position." "I am persuaded that (the Republican) candidates are the most available that could have been selected." *John Rankin in Free Presb.*

In no instance have I found any one who has expressed a doubt that the measures of Radical Abolitionists naturally grow out of their principles, and harmonize with them—that the principles require just such measures for their expression and application. There is no room for two opinions on that point. And in no instance have I seen or heard it pretended that the measures of the "Republican" party grow out of, or harmonize with, the principles of Radical Abolitionists. And yet, professing to *hold* with the Abolitionists, they propose to *act* with the "Republicans"—that is, in opposition to their own professed principles! This is saying, in action, (the most forcible of all speech,) that correct principles have no binding authority, or may be disarmed of that authority by circumstances.

There is nothing uncommon nor singular in this. It is common to hear men say, on almost all moral subjects, that "abstract principles are not safe rules of action. Correct principles are well in their place, but, in this world of ours, they are often impracticable. We must act like 'practical business men'!"

Well. How *do* "practical business men" act? Those, I mean, who accomplish great, desirable, permanent, and important ends? Arkwright, Fulton, Morse—safe navigators, successful agriculturists, inventors, reformers—Luther, Paul, Nehemiah, Moses. Did they achieve their victories by acting at variance with correct principles? Or by holding them in abeyance? Or by parting with them to run after majorities? Or by making compromises with them or about them? Or by suspending obedience to them? Or in any other way than by yielding to them the most reverent and implicit obedience? Never! No. Never! Con over the pages of the world's history, and discover the solitary exception, if you can. The exception, *when* found, will stand side by side with an exception to the All-Wise Creator's veracity and truthfulness—the record of the time when he slumbered and slept! There is no irreverence in saying this. The sublimity of veneration impels the testimony. Abstract principles—correct principles—what are they? They are the pillars of Jehovah's throne. They are the vital strength of his right arm! They

are the changeless rules of his own action. They are the core and the basis of all his commands to his creatures. By these he controls the planets, plants or overthrows nations, gives law to principalities in heaven, builds up his kingdom of holiness on earth, guides the meek in his way, clothes the lilies in beauty, rides on the wings of the wind, and marshals the sea-sands and the stars.

The revelation of a correct principle, is the revelation of God's authority, of God's will, of God's designs, of God's law. Principle is the key note of creation—of the physical universe and of the moral, the essence of all natural laws and all moral laws, of the kingdoms of Providence and of Grace; the substratum of all Decalogues, the living spirit of all Gospels; the law of all law; the verity of all truth. This the One Great and only Lawgiver affirms, when he claims that his commandments are the truth; that his precepts concerning all things are right. Take away from them, (if it could be done,) their righteousness and truth, their conformity, in other words, to the principles that are true and right, and the righteous and truthful lawgiver would then claim for them no authority or reverence.

Whenever a correct principle is revealed to your consciousness, you have in it a revelation of all the authority there is or can be in any divine law, or in the lawgiver himself. To set aside a correct principle is to set Him aside. To depart from it, is to depart from Him. To deride "abstract principles" as a rule of action, is to deride Him. To spurn their guidance is to spurn His guidance. The teachings of his word and of his Spirit can rise no higher and go no further than to teach us the *principles* of his religion. It is a trite saying, on the lips of all preachers and the pens of all commentators, that the Bible is our guide chiefly by the *principles* which it lays down for us and expounds to us. No possible code of specific positive precepts could reach a tithe of the particular cases of conscience arising in the daily discharge of our duties. If conscience, reason, and scripture do not give us the correct principle, if the principle be not authoritative, if it be not our safe conductor, then indeed are we orphans and outcasts in a dark and strange world, without a Father to guide, govern, or protect us.

If you say that the foundation of obligation is God's commandment, the implication is that His commandments are right. And, in saying it, you only proclaim a *moral principle*. But if the authority of moral principle may be set aside on account of circumstances, then this principle also may be thus set aside. If we say that "love is the fulfilling of the law," we affirm a moral principle. But if moral principle may be set aside, then THAT principle may be set aside. If moral principle be not authoritative, then no law founded upon it can be authoritative.

God never departs from moral principle himself, and he never authorizes any of his creatures to do so. It was a violation of principle that "brought death into the world and all our wo." The problem of redeeming the world was the problem of reconciling the claims of moral principle with forgiveness. Christ died "that God might be just, and the justifier of the believer." Not for the sake of saving a

world, would God suffer one jot or tittle of moral principle to be compromised. Let "evangelical Christians" study the claims of moral principle at the foot of the cross, before they decide whether moral principle must needs be sacrificed for the deliverance of Kansas, and whether such a sacrifice would be acceptable or beneficial.

In any exigency depending on the application of the principles that govern matter, men understand that the least departure from these principles ensures defeat. Why do they not understand that the laws that govern the moral and political world, are equally authoritative and inflexible? Universal history is one vast store house of illustrations in point. Humanity bleeds, and the nations are in fetters, from age to age, because *moral principle* does not control politics.

Have I erred, or am I singular, in my definition of moral principle? "Principle," (says Noah Webster) is a general law, comprehending many subordinate truths." It is "a settled rule of action in human beings." Or, that which "serves as a rule of action."

A false principle is a wrong rule of action. A true principle is a right rule of action. If principles are not expected to control human actions, why do we deplore or oppose or endeavor to counteract the belief of wrong principles in religion, in morals, in government, or in politics? Why do we speak of sound principles on the one hand, and of corrupt principles on the other? And of what use is it to teach and to illustrate correct principles, if men may innocently profess them without reducing them to practice? Or if they are not "practicable" and may not safely be confided in?

What do we mean by a man of principle, if we do not mean a man who holds to correct principles, and who reduces them to practice? Is *he* the man of principle, who only assents to correct principle, but declines making it his rule of conduct? What is this but "holding the truth in unrighteousness?" "Thou believest there is one God, thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble." "Show me thy (principles) without thy works, and I will show you my (principles) by my works." [It was a "faith" in correct principles that the Apostle was speaking of, in this passage.] What do we mean by an unprincipled man? Does the term include only those who do not verbally profess a belief in right principles? Does it not include, even more signally, those who profess the truth, but decline reducing it to practice? "Unprincipled"—says Webster, is "not having settled principles." "Settled!" And how is a man to have settled principles who will not plant himself on them, and direct his foot-steps by them? Of what manner of use can they be to him, or to the world?

Why and how do abolitionists and Republicans fasten upon the old Democratic party the charge of being *unprincipled*? Why, and how, but because, (and by showing the fact) that in theory, by profession, by intellectual perception and approbation, they hold to the principle of the equal and inalienable rights of all men, while in their measures, they refuse to acknowledge the binding authority of those principles? That from motives of policy, in the senate chamber and at the ballot box, they consent to the

enslavement of millions of their countrymen

Now if this makes the Democratic party unprincipled, what shall be said of "Republicans," and especially of "Radical Abolitionists" who, while fastening upon the Democrats that charge, permit themselves, amid their still higher professions, and their clearer perceptions of the Constitutional powers and duties of the General Government, to consent, for at least four years longer (though the pledge is without that limitation) to that same thing? They see difficulties in the way, and they have their motives, their calculations, and their expedients:—and anti-slavery Democrats, (as they think themselves to be) have theirs. Their position in respect to Kansas, is indeed different. But their position in respect to the millions of slaves, is the same.

"Truth is worthless until it is exemplified in practice." So said the Free Presbyterian of July 16, and it said truly. But soon after, the Free Presbyterian joined the "Republicans," and it then said "the difference between us and our abolition friends is one of policy, and not of principle."

Now, if principles have no binding authority, then the Free Presbyterian, the True American, Frederick Douglass, &c. &c. may be altogether on the right track. And if the Oldline Democrats could but be persuaded to "switch off" from the Border Ruffian Kansas track, they would be very nearly or quite on the same track with them, and together in search of "the finale of all exciting commotions," the goal proposed by the Republicans. But if principles have any binding authority, then they are all wrong.

2. "WE MUST DO WHAT WE JUDGE WILL PRODUCE THE GREATEST AMOUNT OF GOOD, IN OUR POWER TO ACCOMPLISH."

This is laid down with great confidence as a principle or rule of action, by those who propose to go with the Republican party, while they profess to hold the principles of Radical Abolitionists.

How they can make it appear that this (or any other "principle") has any binding authority, after they have repudiated the binding authority of their own principles as Radical Abolitionists, I am unable to perceive.

But without stopping to insist on this, I must remark that the principle above laid down needs to be stated more fully and carefully, before its truth can be safely admitted. If it be taken unrestricted, as it now stands, in the sense in which it would be commonly understood, and in accordance with the object for which it is brought forward, I think I shall show that the principle—if it be a principle—is not a correct or safe one. In order to make it true or trustworthy, it must be so amended as to make it read somewhat after this fashion.

"We must do what we can, in accordance with moral right (or in accordance with God's will or commandments) to produce what we judge to be the greatest amount of good in our power to accomplish; remembering that truth and equity are 'good,' in the highest sense, and that 'the greatest amount of good' can never be attained by compromising or postponing, their claims."

But in this shape, the rule would not answer the ends for which it is brought forward. I must examine it, therefore, in its original form

as above, and as commonly urged on our attention.

In the absolute, unrestricted sense, the principle is very far from being a safe or a correct one. No man living can tell whether "the greatest amount of good" would not be produced by the election of Buchanan. It may be that the nation needs all the chastisement, disgrace, and degradation that might naturally be expected from such an event. It may be that even so great a calamity may be necessary to show the people of the North the greatness of their guilt, and the true remedy, in their own hands. It may be, that the election of Fremont; on the other hand, would only "heal the hurt of the nation slightly," inducing a cry of 'peace, peace, when there is no peace,' and thus fasten upon us the fatal malady. God, who sees all things, may see this, and in mercy as well as in judgment, may give us over again into the hands of the slave power, for a season, in order to our final deliverance. Suppose this is to be the case; and suppose there were some far-seeing abolitionists who were fully persuaded that this was to be the fact; and that they should moreover apprehend that their own votes would be necessary to its consummation:—Would that make it their duty, or confer upon them the moral right to cast their votes for Buchanan? No. Certainly not!—But why not? The principle of "doing what they believed would produce the greatest amount of good," might be pertinently claimed by them. And why should they not follow it? Simply because it would be "doing evil that good may come," which would be morally wrong. It would be in violation of God's commandments, which require us to vote for good rulers who will "break every yoke." Such abolitionists would be condemned by the same rule that forbids abolitionists to vote for the continued existence of slavery in the states, in order to help Kansas.

The betrayal of Jesus Christ was instrumental of the "greatest amount of good." But that was no justification for Judas. Nor would it have been even if he had foreseen the result of human redemption, and had acted in the view of it. Men have no right to do wrong, in order to produce good. Short sighted men cannot tell, by any foresight of events or calculations of consequences, what actions will produce the greatest good. Their business is to do what God commands them. He always commands them to do right, to obey the truth, to follow wherever correct principle leads them. Duties are theirs. Events are in God's hands. They and they only, who implicitly and simply follow what they know to be right and true, "produce the greatest amount of good in their power." The Tempter persuaded our first parents that "the greatest amount of good" could be accomplished, even their elevation to be as gods, by an act of apparently trivial disobedience. This has been the essence and core of all Satanic temptation, ever since. Men never sin, except under the delusion that something which they conceive to be "good" can best be secured by it. The rule therefore, in its vague sense, its ordinary acceptance, its common use, its legitimate results, can be productive only of evil instead of "good."

A CASE IN POINT—"ANTI-SLAVERY CONSISTENCY."

The false principle under consideration, finds expression, substantially, though with some variation of phraseology, in the following:

"Anti-Slavery consistency itself requires of the anti-slavery voter that disposition of his vote and influence which, in all the circumstances and likelihoods of the case, will tend most to the triumph of free principles in the counsels and government of the nation." * * * "Right anti-slavery action is that which deals the deadliest blows that can be given at that particular time. Such action is always consistent, however different may be the forms in which it expresses itself."—*Frederick Douglass' paper, Aug. 15.*

This is given in justification of the policy of voting with the Republican party. Well then. Let us see how the Republican party is already carrying out this same principle of anti-slavery consistency. The Republicans in the House of Representatives, with few exceptions, voted for Mr. Dunn's Kansas Pacification Bill, and secured its passage in the House, though it failed to pass the pro-slavery Senate. By this bill, those who voted for it conceded the present legality of slavery in Kansas where it exists without the pretense of being sanctioned by any positive law, unless it be the infamous enactments of the bogus Border Ruffian Legislature, which the Free State settlers refuse to recognize. Thus, the House, unwarily, recognized the legality of those enactments! They conceded also the duty of returning fugitive slaves, even those who might here after be born as slaves in Kansas! This they did, doubtless, under the belief that "in all the circumstances of the case"—"the triumph of free principles in the councils of the Government and the nation" would be best promoted by this compromise. It would produce the greatest amount of good in their power. It was, in their view, "the deadliest blow that could be given at that particular time." Their calculation was that, by giving up, for the present, what they were unable to secure, they could gain a present "pacification," which would place them on "a vantage ground," (as some express it) from whence they could retrieve what they now, temporarily, relinquished. If they could gain time to fill up Kansas with free settlers, they could get rid of slavery, by and by. This, we know, was their argument. And it agreed, perfectly, with the whole system of tactics upon which the Republican party is founded. But, was there any "anti-slavery consistency" in this? I will let Frederick Douglass speak on this point. Hear him! Speaking of this action of the House, he says,

"We hold that that morality is of a questionable character, to say the least, which consents to the accomplishment of a great good on condition of the extension, even for one hour, of a great evil; right and wrong, good and evil, are antagonistic elements which can never act in concert."—*Frederick Douglass' paper, Aug. 22.*

For the word "extension" put 'existence' as it ought to have been, and the cases are exactly parallel. A voter for the Republican party and its candidate consents to the continued enslavement, for four years, of all the slaves in the slave states, and the morality of his action is, therefore, "to say the least, of a questionable character." Thus readily can Frederick Douglass, the "Abolition" Editor, when his vision is clear, confute Frederick Douglass, the "Republican" voter. What better than just such action as that of the Republicans in the House, is to be expected from a Republican administration?

ANOTHER PHASE OF THE FALLACY.

"The conclusive answer to all who object to this ground" (that of voting with the Republicans) "is the indisputable truth that neither in religion nor morals, can a man be justified in refusing to assist his fellow men to accomplish a possible good thing, simply because his fellows refuse to accomplish some other good thing which they deem impossible."—*Frederick Douglass, Aug. 15.*

This statement does not cover the whole ground, nor present the true question. When an "abolitionist" votes to inaugurate a "Republican" administration, he goes beyond the mere act of joining with them to relieve Kansas. He joins with them also in their pledge to let slavery continue in the States. Their act, in this matter, becomes his act, because he votes that the government shall be administered as they propose to administer it. Rather than miss the chance of having an administration that he hopes may relieve Kansas, he votes to have an administration that he knows well enough will help keep the slaves in bondage, by continuing to maintain the fugitive slave bill, and in many other ways.

To have made the cases parallel, or to have stated the case as it is, Mr. Douglass should have affirmed the moral duty of assisting his neighbor to save a drowning man, even though in doing it, he should find it necessary to help that same neighbor to worry with blood-hounds twenty other men in the same stream to prevent their swimming ashore. But Mr. Douglass would not like to affirm that. Let him imagine himself again a fugitive slave, with his present knowledge of the facts, and he will see the matter in a different light.

The case of refusing to assist individuals to do one good act, on the ground that they refuse to do another good act, is very different from that of refusing to vote for installing an administration that would come into power through my vote, pledged beforehand, (and with my knowledge of the fact,) not to do the work which God commands all civil governments to do, and which the nature of civil government requires to be done. My individual neighbor wields or refuses to wield his powers, on his own responsibility, not upon mine. But I am responsible for the acts and the delinquencies of a National Administration that comes into power by the help of my influence and vote.

So that the parallel fails likewise, in this. I do not refuse to assist the Republicans in relieving Kansas, merely because they refuse to go further and help liberate the slaves, but because also, my vote for such representatives authorizing them to act in my behalf, with a full knowledge of their intentions, conveys with it my refusal to liberate the slaves. I consent to their policy in the matter, and go along with them.

3. MINORITIES NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR OWN VOTES!—HOW TO HAVE INFLUENCE.

And this reminds me of another false principle—or denial of correct principle, which is involved in such excuses. It is assumed by some that God has one rule of action for the guidance of Governments, Administrations, and majorities, and another rule for voting citizens and minorities. The Government, the Administration, the majority, are indeed bound, (say they,) to liberate the slaves, because they have the power. But individual votes and minorities have not

the power, and therefore are not responsible for what they cannot help. The Administration, Government, or majority, having assumed the responsibility, (which is indeed devolved upon them by constitutional provision that the majority must govern,) and having determined what they will do, or will not do, the minority and the individual voter are relieved of that burden.

And from all this it is inferred that when the individual voter or the minority "can do no better," they are at liberty to cease protesting by their votes, and may as well fall in with the majority, and vote with them and for them, for the sake of securing other desirable ends. The same deference is extended to nominating conventions. Minorities and individuals, it is assumed, have no ability to stand it out against them, and are under no moral obligation to do so. They must vote for the nominee of some great and numerous party, whether his aims and character correspond with the divinely revealed prerequisites of a civil ruler or no. It will do no good for them to stand alone and be singular, and make themselves appear "ridiculous," and so they must go down stream, with the multitudes around them!

The prophet Jeremiah seems to have been in danger, at one period, of being borne away with the pressure of this idea. Heavy judgments were impending upon the Jewish nation, for its political sins, of which the neglect to execute justice for the oppressed, was a prominent one. Jeremiah reproveth them, but stood almost alone. He poured forth his complaints to God, describing the hatred and contempt he encountered for his stubbornness and singularity. He had lost his influence with the people and could do them no more good. No doubt he was tempted to give over his efforts, and virtually consent with them. Then came the word of the Lord to him, and to all others in like condition.

"Let them return unto THEE, but return not thou unto them, and I will make thee unto this people a fenced and brazen wall. And they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail against thee, for I am with thee to save and to deliver thee, saith the Lord." *Jeremiah*, xv. 19, 20, with context.

This is God's method of giving power and influence to reformers. No such promises are made to reformers who trim to go with the multitude. Yet Jeremiah was, no doubt, derided, all his days, as an "impracticable"—an "abstractionist"—who knew not enough of the world and of human nature to have any influence in political affairs. There were multitudes of popular reformers, no doubt, in his times, but their names have not come down to us.

The duties of minorities and individuals are as plain as the duties of majorities and administrations. They are essentially the same. The individual is bound to vote and to *continue* voting, for what the majority and the government *ought to do*. He is bound to set, always, an example which, if all others would follow, the Government would be administered righteously and by righteous rulers. In no other way can his influence be on God's side. In no other way can he deliver himself from being partaker of other men's sins. In no other way can he commend himself to every man's conscience, in the sight of God, or gain the character of a thoroughly honest and sincere man. What would you think of a stockholder in a rail road com-

pany, who should loudly remonstrate against the running of the cars on the Sabbath, as being a very wicked thing, and yet, as soon as he found himself outvoted by the other stockholders, should turn round and vote with them? Did you ever know a man who would do such a thing, where his own private interests were concerned? Did you ever know a wool-grower who, being a tariff man because he believed he could make five hundred dollars a year by a protective tariff, turn round and vote against such a tariff, because he found the majority against him?

Why did not Caleb and Joshua turn round and vote with the other spies, when they found themselves out-voted by them? If they had done so, and if Moses and Aaron had adopted the "platform" of their constituency, when would the tribes have crossed the Jordan and took possession of Canaan? Did those four "impracticables" "throw away their votes"? Did they thus become "men of no influence"? Remember—it is a record of political action, of political integrity, as contrasted with its opposite, that the inspired historian of those times has spread out for our instruction. The peculiar and miraculous incidents of the story do not obscure its illustrations, nor neutralize the principles of political wisdom contained in it. The same God who controlled the political world, then, controls it now, and by the same laws of political cause and effect.

MINORITIES RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACTION OF MAJORITIES!

Having thus kindly instructed us how, when in the minority, we can innocently vote against our own principles in order to go with the multitude, our subtle casuists, all at once, become the faithful guardians of our integrity, and warn us of the guilt to be incurred by voting in *accordance* with our principles, instead of voting against them! They first absolve us from the responsibility of our own votes, and then load us with responsibility for the votes of others. Thus, it was urged, some years ago, that, although the Whig party sustained slavery and was therefore a wicked party, yet since it was less wicked than the Democratic party, the abolitionists were morally bound to vote for the Whigs against the Democrats, and if they did not, and if the Democrats should thereby come into power, the abolitionists would be morally responsible for their evil doings!

The New York Times and the New York Tribune have not yet ceased to charge it upon abolitionists as a great sin, that they refused to vote for Fillmore, Webster and Clay! This duty of voting for "the least of two evils" was boldly vindicated by Rev. Dr. Taylor of New Haven, and explained to include the duty of voting "for the lesser devil of the two," if the rival parties should nominate two devils! The prospect of electing "just" rulers by such a policy furnishes a fine comment upon the maxim of voting so as to secure "the greatest amount of good"!

Some of the "Republican" editors who were once Whigs are now bringing the same charge against abolitionists who decline voting with them. "Their policy," says the Jonesville Independent, "is the same as when they refused voting for Henry Clay to keep out Texas." And others are following in the same track.

"Will it not be a fearful thing in the Radicals, to defeat us in effecting so much of a reform as the Republican movement proposes?"—"J. S. W." in the *Am. Baptist*.

"Bitter, indeed, would be the reproach, and deep and pointed would be the regret, if, through the Radical Abolitionists, victory should perch on the bloody standard of slave-rule, as would be the case, if Fremont and Dayton were defeated and Buchanan and Breckenridge were elected."—*Frederick Douglass*, Aug. 15.

Mr. Douglass, it seems, has no fears of "reproach" or "regret," for voting *against* his own principles, but dreads the reproach and regret arising from a vote in *favor* of them. From all which we learn, likewise, that we are not responsible for the platforms, the utterances, the measures, the doings, or the consequences of the doings of a majority that are pledged against our own principles and measures,—provided we vote *with* them;—but we *are* most fearfully responsible for all these, when we vote *against* them!

Let me try my friend Frederick Douglass, a little, and see whether he will abide by his position. There are, I will suppose, three political parties. The first is all that Frederick Douglass or myself could desire it to be, but it is at present a hopeless minority. The second is a thorough abolition party except in one little item. It avows the purpose of seizing Frederick Douglass and his family, and carrying them into the hell of southern slavery. The third goes farther, and avows the purpose of carrying all the rest of the colored people of the North into slavery. Suppose the second and third parties are so nearly even balanced that the issue between them is extremely doubtful. Would Frederick Douglass think that William Goodell ought to vote for the second party, and that he would incur just "reproach" for failing to do so, in case the third party should, in consequence, succeed? No. He would not. Neither will William Goodell incur just "reproach" for not voting with the Republican party with its foot on three and a half millions of slaves, even though the still more ruthless Buchanan party should thus succeed, and do its more bloody work. I may not—I cannot—I will not, vote fetters for my fellow men. Doing my own duty, and urging others to do the same, I cannot be made responsible for their misdeeds. I may not, I must not commit a great wrong, to prevent others from doing a greater.

Common sense, and common conscience repudiate the theory. "Republicans" repudiate it, when Democrats charge on them the responsibility of that portion of the border Ruffian code for Kansas, which the Senate offered to repeal on condition that the "Republican" House should acknowledge the validity of that bogus legislation, and recognize as legal, the remainder of those atrocious statutes. The defence of the "Republican" House, is the defence of Abolitionists who refuse to go with Republicans in ignoring the rights of enslaved millions.

VI. FALSE MAXIMS OF POLICY.

Intertwined with all these unfounded assumptions and false principles, there are innumerable false maxims of policy. Some of these have been sufficiently exposed, already, but others of them require a more distinct attention.

THE ISSUE AT THIS ELECTION—WHAT IS IT? HOW AND BY WHOM IS IT PRESENTED?

"But the issue (of the abolition of slavery) is not

now presented to us." . . . "The Kansas question is the practical question now before the people." . . . "The issue is forced upon us by the slave-power." . . . "We must meet the issue as it is now tendered to us." . . . "All men will agree that, generally speaking, the point attacked is the point to be defended." . . . "We see clearly enough that we shall have to go against slavery in the States, but we must not go so far, now."

Such are some of the utterances that meet our eyes and ears, daily, and they come from "abolitionists" who have concluded to vote with the "Republican" party.

But whose prerogative is it to present "issues" to the people for their decision? Who is it that rightfully and truthfully claims supreme authority, and providential control over the nations? Who is it that, as a matter of fact, does present vital "issues" to the people, whenever they are presented, at all? In what manner, under what laws, and by what methods, does He present such issues? Is it quite certain that the Arch Deceiver is His sole Vicegerent, commissioned with the exclusive prerogative of shaping and presenting "issues" to the people? Of directing their exclusive attention to such points as best suits his convenience to occupy them with, for the time being? And must they needs confine their attacks to the points he marks out for them?

God's "issue" which He presents to this American Nation is the abolition of American Slavery. All the attributes of his nature, all the principles and methods of his moral and providential government, all the purposes of his redeeming mercy, stand sentinels, night and day, to see to it that this "issue" is not spurned aside, with impunity.

"This issue is not yet presented to us," it is said! "It will be presented, in due time, but we have not come to that, now!"

What do Christians mean, what do abolitionists mean, what do men of common sense mean, when they talk thus? Has there ever been a moment of time, since the first slave was landed on our shores, in which God's commandment to the people of this country has not been—"Execute judgment in the morning—deliver him that is spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor." "Break every yoke. Let the oppressed go free." "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof?"

"But the issue is not yet presented to us!" Astonishing! For almost two and a half centuries, God has been speaking to us on this subject. He has been speaking by his faithful witnesses, from the beginning, by Benezet and by Woolman, by Hopkins and by Edwards, by Jay and by the hosts of his compatriots. By the lips and pens of modern Abolitionists themselves he has been presenting it afresh and unremittingly, in all the varieties of human utterance, for nearly a quarter of a century. By a series of wonderful Providences, he has been presenting it himself, and is presenting it, most fearfully, still. By his word, by his law, by his gospel, by his spirit, by the self-evident truths and the quenchless aspirations he has engraven upon the conscience of all men, and interwoven in the living texture of all human existence, he has been continually presenting it. By his sword of retributive justice, suspended over, or already descending upon us, he is presenting that same issue still. All "the circumstances and likelihoods of the case" seem to suggest the biniury whether he may not now be presenting

it to us for the last time, and whether the now pending Presidential election, (to be held in the midst of his sore judgments, revealing, in letters of blood, the nature and tendencies of slavery, along with His Divine displeasure against us, as a Nation, for having so long neglected to suppress it) is not to decide finally that issue. And yet there are abolitionists, yes, "Radical" abolitionists, who tell us that "the issue is not yet presented to us!" And, very strangely, this declaration comes to me by the same mails and sometimes in the same letters or publications in which may be detected the apprehension that the time for political action has gone by, already, and that there is nothing left for us but the sword! Has the spirit of that madness which forebodes coming destruction, the maniac's derision of danger, alternated or commingled with his shriek of despair, already begun to appear in our ranks? How can such persons be made to see the true "issue presented to us," until after it shall have been decided, and decided fatally, by their own perversity, or blindness?

And why do they suppose that "the issue of the abolition of slavery is not now presented to us?" "The Kansas issue" (say they) "is forced upon us by the slave power." That is, the authors of the Kansas Nebraska bill, the Border Ruffians of Missouri, Toombs, Douglas, Pierce, Atchinson, Stringfellow, Shannon, Buford, and bully Brooks, in conformity with the councils of Calhoun and McDuffie, have determined to shift the issue and to transfer the contest from Southern soil to Northern, to put and keep the forces of liberty on the defensive, so that the Southern volcano may remain untouched and secure.

And, moreover, James Gordon Bennett, Henry J. Raymond, Horace Greeley, and the Philadelphia Convention have assumed the responsibility of accepting, on behalf of the "friends of free Kansas" "the issue as it is now tendered to us," and under the gratuitous additional pledge of letting the invading enemy alone, at home, where he lives, and where it would be easy to destroy him! This, say they, is "the only practical issue now before the nation"—the question whether the national Government, remaining, by common consent, the national protector of slavery in one half of the nation, shall be restricted from being its protector also in Kansas! A "practical issue" truly—and one at which demons might laugh!

And so, on these grounds, forsooth—the great national "issue" of American Slavery or of American liberty, the issue of two hundred years standing, the issue existing of necessity, in the changeless nature of things, the issue presented to us by the God of Nature, of Providence, and of Revelation, the issue apparently on the point of decision, in some way, is to be spurned aside—"just for this once," definitively for at least four years longer, and indefinitely, for all future time! In all the histories, ancient and modern, of political stupidity, and insanity, is there any thing—can there be any thing, that exceeds this? Or where shall we look for its parallel?

When Moses and Aaron stood before Pharaoh, they delivered, in substance, the same divine message that abolitionists, for nearly a quarter of a century, have been delivering to the Pharaohs of this nation. "LET MY PEOPLE GO THAT

THEY MAY SERVE ME!" Intent, like Calhoun and his disciples, upon diverting their attention and thwarting their purpose, by changing the issue, the "Slave Power" of Egypt, instead of complying with the divine message, determined on extending and confirming its power by making fresh aggressions. The wonted tale of brick was required, but the straw was withheld. The Hebrews fell into the trap set for them. They murmured against Moses, and were ready, like our modern "Republicans," to yield assent to the continuance of the ancient bondage, on condition of a removal of the new aggression. They thought it necessary, at least for the present, to "meet the issue then tendered to them," and let the *main* issue go by, for the indefinite and uncertain future. It was "the best thing for them, at that time." Thus they reasoned. Suppose Moses and Aaron had yielded the point to them. Suppose they had stipulated for a removal of the new grievance, suspending the demand. "Let my people go," or translating into—"Let them have straw?" Suppose them to have gained their point, to have propitiated their "Slave Power," to have quieted the Hebrews, to have achieved "the finale of all existing commotions." What would have become of their Divine Mission? How could they have retained the divine favor? When would have been the exodus—the overthrow—the deliverance—the Song of Miriam and of Moses?

But all this, you will perhaps say, is too ancient, too much commingled with the miraculous and the marvellous. You must have maxims of policy, suited to more modern times. Come then, let us examine the matter in the light of common every-day experience. Suppose you are a general. You are dealing with a besieged enemy. Your shots are evidently disturbing him. A few more rounds, and he must capitulate. He finds the necessity of diverting your attention, of drawing off your forces to some other point. By stealth he sends out a detachment to assault one of your outposts. What will you do? Will you quit your advanced position and march back your main forces to that outpost? Will you proclaim in his ears, that if he will only let your out-post alone, he may remain at home as long as he pleases undisturbed? Will you do this, when all his habits and his necessities assure you, that until he is himself destroyed he will be the destroyer of every thing that is holy, and lovely and precious, all around him?

Or, suppose you are a physician. You have a patient whose blood is all poisoned. You are at work with remedies well adapted to remove the virus and restore him to health. All at once the disease breaks out violently in a terrible sore at one of his extremities, his right foot. It becomes painful and looks horribly. Your patient is alarmed. He implores you to quit purging his system for the removal of the malady, pledging yourself to let it alone, there, where it is sheltered by the constitution, for at least four years, while you concentrate all your appliances upon his foot, such appliances as will drive the disease back into the system again, to remain quiet, to course through his blood, as before, under a restored Missouri compromise, never to descend below his knee joints again. He has a theory of his physical constitution, maintained by the most learned doctors, according to which this is the true conservative course.

He is afraid of extreme remedies, and desires to be quiet.

His family and friends all agree with him. You find yourself out-voted, twenty to one. What will you do? Will you turn round and vote with them, because it is important to have the enemies of the disease all act together? Or for fear you will be "throwing away your vote?" Or because "one thing must be done at a time?" Or because "half a loaf is better than none?" Or because you "believe they are all very sincere?" Or because they "are not yet prepared for the right measure?" Or because this foot "question is now of most pressing and immediate importance?" Or because "it will be a fearful thing to thwart the good they are proposing to do?" Or because you are "persuaded that the new physician they intend voting for, is the most available that could have been selected?" Or because the anti-disease "force must be presented as an unit?" Will you do thus, though you "clearly see that the opposite course will have to be pursued, by and by, when the true issue shall have been presented?" Would you justify yourself in such a course under the plea that you are doing it all "under protest" "maintaining all your former principles, but changing only your policy" in a wild-goose chase after "the greatest amount of good?"

Let me not be misunderstood. I am not making light of the disease developing itself with such terrible symptoms in Kansas. I am not for postponing, for a single moment, the "issue" presented by it to this nation, nor the application of the remedy. On the other hand, my complaint is that the "Republican" physicians of Kansas and of the country do not begin to understand the greatness, the extent, nor the real nature of the disease, that they do not propose the only true remedy, but even pledge themselves in advance, not to make use of it, that they would "heal the hurt" of Kansas and of the nation, "slightly" with medicines that can have no other effect than to quiet the patient into a fatal repose.

To drop the figure, I do not complain that the Kansas issue is presented, or too strongly presented, but that it is *falsely* presented—feebly presented—presented, as the sole issue, to the explicit exclusion of the main issue, the real issue upon the prompt and right decision of which the fate of Kansas as well as of the whole nation must depend. The Kansas issue, as God presents it to us, in his Providence, is the old issue of the two past centuries, culminating now, not at some future time, and demanding of us the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery, not the vain and atheistic attempt to stave it off, with impunity, for four years, when God requires it to be done now.

"BUT WE MUST HAVE A MAJORITY OF VOTES, OR WE CAN EFFECT NOTHING."

"We are not living in an age of miracles now," it may be said, "under the guidance of Moses and Aaron. Nor are we talking of military evolutions, or of medical treatment. Dropping such figures, we must come down to our own times, and to the plain facts we have to do with, without metaphor, and without irrelevant comparisons. We are talking of political action here, in the United States, where majorities govern, and where, as every body acquainted

with politics knows, it is necessary to have a majority of votes, in order to carry any proposed measure. We are not Caleb and Joshua. We are not Moses and Aaron. We are only plain American citizens, where the vote of every man, good or bad, wise or ignorant, counts as much as our own."

"We can't elect the abolition candidates. We must vote so as to elect! We must not throw away our votes."—*Letter of W. L.*

"I believe with Gerrit Smith and Wm. Goodell that there is not a slave legally held in the Union, but then, we could not, perhaps, in twenty years, elect a man on that position." *John Rankin, in Free Presbyterian.*

The position then is, that we must always vote with the majority; or at least with a party that we think will soon become a majority! So that if we had no prospect of electing Fremont, we must not vote at all, and so "lose our vote," or else vote for Fillmore or Buchanan—for the one we believed we could elect!

The morality and the wisdom of this rule, I am equally unable to comprehend. It brings us back again to the maxim of voting for "the lesser devil of the two," if we vote at all. I know of no political corruption in the country that goes beyond the maxim of voting always with the majority. It would carry us even below the "lesser devil" doctrine, whenever the greater devil could probably be elected and the other could not. I cannot believe that my friends W. L. and John Rankin would carry out the principle when they should find it leading them quite so far as this. They would disclaim the rule, or discover that it has exceptions. But how would they draw the line of exceptions, if not by admitting that we must not vote against our principles in order to go with the majority? And this would spoil their rule, for the uses for which they have brought it forward. They would violate their principles in voting for the Republican platform and candidate, which they could have no moral right to do—no—not even to secure what they believed to be "the greatest amount of good."

But aside from the morality of the maxim, just look at its policy. Look at its supposed facts. 'The majority,' you say, 'always governs in this country.' Are you quite sure of it? The slaveholders have always governed in this country. Have they ever been the majority? Have they ever been otherwise than a very lean minority, even of the white voters? Here then, to begin with, you have a very notable exception, of sixty-seven years unbroken standing, to the rule that 'majorities always rule in this country.' On this slavery question, the slaveholders, though a lean minority, have always ruled. And how comes it to pass that they have done so?

You cannot answer this question by pointing me to the three-fifths rule, which gives them a disproportionate vote in the House of Representatives and in the Electoral Colleges. The question runs back of all that. How came that petty minority to gain the establishment of that rule, in the first place? And how have they kept it in existence, ever since? It is not in the Constitution, you know, for that does not describe slaves, but aliens, as all "Radical" abolitionists believe. But if you say it is in the Constitution, how came it to be put there? It must have been done at the dictation of the minority of slaveholders, must it not?

But, besides all this, the three-fifths vote

after all, does not give the slave States a majority either in the House of Representatives or in the Electoral College. So that the South does not govern the North by means of the three-fifths rule. You must find out some other secret of their power.

If you say that it arises out of the necessities of their position as slaveholders, in other words, as the recognized nobility of this country, "born to rule" and to be revered, then I tell you that if you would break the spell of their supremacy, you must stand sternly aloof from all political parties, platforms, candidates, and political leaderships, (Congressional and editorial) that do not distinctly and consistently deny, by words and deeds, the legal and constitutional title of these haughty nobles to the prerogatives assumed by them, and hitherto conceded to them! You must vote for no candidates, and with no party not pledged to hurl them, at once, and forever, from their lofty seats, as the lords of their equal fellow-citizens. And of course, you must cut your connection with the so-called "Republican party," its candidates, and its leaders.

But if you reject this solution of slaveholding supremacy, you have still before you the bald fact, the modern fact, neither antiquated nor miraculous, that minorities, very lean minorities, and on the side of falsehood, may rule, do rule, and have ruled in this country. It is no metaphor, no figure of speech, no comparison. It is the literal prosaic fact. You are "practical" men. How will you account for it? How will you grapple with it? You are not running after empty "abstractions." Tell us how it is that minorities rule in this country. Tell us why an ABOLITION minority may not also rule!

To help your conceptions, just here, let me remind you of some other minorities, not slaveholders, that have ruled in this country. A few mechanics, cartmen, and day-laborers, in New York city, took it into their heads, one winter, that the connection between the Federal Treasury and the United States' Bank ought to be broken up. A strange fancy, was it not? How came it into their heads? Some of the cartmen who handled the kegs of dollars (what few there were of them) in the vaults of the Bank, in New York and Philadelphia, and to and from certain deposits in Wall street and Chesnut street, told one another some strange stories. Suspicions arose that something might be rotten in Denmark—and elsewhere. Long winter evenings were spent over it. Plodding "abstractionists" unknown on 'Change, were invited to look into the matter. The result was a firm conviction that Federal funds were not altogether safe in such keeping. The "abstractionists" told them it was unphilosophical to suppose that they could be. With no "practical business men" to correct them, the conviction spread. It reached and revolutionized Tammany Hall. From this fortress, it carried the city of New York, against the influence of its bankers, and brokers, and millionaires. Next it carried the State of New York—then the Federal Government. The deposits were removed. But, at that time, not a tithe of the voters of the nation knew why or wherefore. The bankers of the country had no suspicion of what, long afterwards, proved to have been the fact. Great statesmen, like great bankers, believed the Bank

to be solvent. Even John Quincy Adams had full confidence in the statements of "Nick Biddle." But the bubble exploded after a while. The long-standing insolvency of the bank was disclosed, in the final winding up of its affairs. Among the many lessons of this history, the only one we have now to do with, is this—the power of earnest, resolute, self-consistent, *minorities* to control majorities, especially when they have the truth on their side.

But *how*, you will ask, was the nation carried? Was it not by obtaining a majority of all the voters? No, not in this case—not until after the measure was first carried, and the result tested. At the removal of the deposits, the nation was astonished, and, for the most part, indignant. A popular vote, then, would have promptly avenged it. But the deed was done, and, afterwards, the nation acquiesced.

But how was the action of the Government secured without any popular vote? Thus: The anti-bank men, while yet a minority in the city, controlled Tammany Hall, because Tammany Hall needed their votes, and could get them *in no other way!* The "Democracy" of the city and of the State yielded, from the same pressure. The powers at Washington, foreseeing the evil, hid themselves, by yielding. They knew they had to do with determined, resolute men, who were bent on their object, whose votes went always with their convictions; and such men, they knew, were not to be spurned aside.

They knew this, because they knew—(Andrew Jackson certainly did)—how the petty minority of slaveholders had always governed. Had the anti-bank men acted like the great mass of professed abolitionists, had they only *preached* their principles, and then yielded them up at the ballot-box, the connection between the U. S. Bank and the Federal Treasury might have been indefinitely continued, and the bankruptcy of the bank undetected, perhaps to the present day.

Other instances of the kind might be cited; but I pass them by, to notice another class which may show—not how minorities, while, *remaining* such, have governed majorities—but how minorities have become majorities, in their turn. Assuredly it could not be by the process of voting with the majorities already existing—nor for any party not cherishing their own aims. In this way, no great enterprise has ever yet been carried, in this country, to my knowledge.

I can well remember when, in Massachusetts and Connecticut, the Congregational ministers were supported, in obedience to statute, by a town or a parish tax. The institution was as venerable, as generally popular, and as warmly cherished, as the public common-school. Only a few disaffected persons demurred. Very few of these had any social standing in respectable society; and those of them who had enjoyed such standing, were soon found to lose caste. They were accounted infidels or disorganizers, and their company was shunned. Mothers with marriageable daughters, and fathers with hopeful, aspiring sons, avoided the reproach of "opposing the minister's tax." It was the same as to oppose religious institutions and to trample on public order. Even among the dis-favored sects, as Baptists, Methodists and Friends, very few were inclined to disturb the existing order of things, by carrying the ques-

tion to the polls. The Federalists, then in the ascendancy, were firm supporters of the ancient arrangement. The Democracy, themselves a lean minority, was afraid to hazard its tardy growth, by carrying such an additional weight. A "third party" of "Tolerationists" had to be organized. For many years it polled but a mere handful of votes. But they resolutely *persevered*. The Democrats, at length, claiming to be "the more favorable party," though not fully and openly committed to their measures, began to court their votes. 'Twas all in vain, until the new doctrine was boldly introduced into the Democratic platform. The minority became the majority, by the uniform withholding of their votes from all who were not fully committed to their measures.

The rise and progress of the Democratic party itself, in New England, might be told in very nearly the same words. Tariff men and anti-tariff men, bank men and anti-bank men, Jackson men and anti-Jackson men, have always succeeded in their objects, precisely in proportion to the uncompromising fidelity with which they have stood by their principles and professions at the ballot-box. The first indication of faltering or of hesitancy, there, has been the signal of declining influence, and ultimate absorption or dissolution. Anti-masonry, Temperance, and Abolition, have presented no exception to the general rule.

Nothing but resolute, persevering, uncompromising action, on the part of his enthusiastic friends, carried Gen. Jackson into the Presidential chair. Their first attempt, by an obscure nomination, in Tennessee, followed up by a local polling of a few hundred votes, in 1820, was the butt of editorial derision throughout the country, and by both the political parties.

Peculiar exigencies, in 1824, induced a few eastern politicians to encourage a renewal of the nomination, as a ruse, to reduce the vote for Henry Clay, but with no apprehension of carrying more than two or three thousand votes. To their dismay, the name of Andrew Jackson was carried before the House, almost to the defeat of Adams, for whose benefit the ball had been set rolling. Four years afterwards, Jackson displaced Adams by the popular vote. Thus powerful are resolute, consistent, persevering minorities, even when *mere men*, not vital principles nor important measures constitute the basis of action.

"GREAT PRINCIPLES AND RADICAL REFORMS MUST BE CARRIED, BY ATTEMPTING ONE STEP AT A TIME."

If this maxim were never so sound, its application does not require abolitionists to vote with "Republicans," whose policy has already been tried and proved a failure. The panacea of "non-extension" has been applied, or attempted to be applied, by the friends of liberty, ever since and before the ordinance of 1787. Local and temporary victories have been achieved, but the tide of slavery has come back again, rolled over Wilmot provisos, swept away the Missouri and the 1850 compromises, and is now inundating Kansas. The prospects of turning back the tide by "non-extension" tactics, at this late hour, is more than doubtful—is well nigh hopeless, and at best can secure only a temporary respite.

All the varied attempts at gradual abolition, have proved a failure. Colonization has been found an obstacle, not an auxiliary. Attempts to stop the internal slave trade, to abolish slavery in the Federal District and Territories, to get rid of fugitive slave bills, and pro-slavery diplomacy, legislation, jurisprudence, and executive subserviency, have all been pushed, till there is neither courage nor strength to push them longer. The "Republicans" disclaim all intention of attempting it, except in respect to Kansas, and even there the "Republicans" in the House, balk, and falter, and hesitate. There is no "one step at a time" left for us, but the step of a direct onset at the heart of the monster that cannot be fettered. We have tried "one thing at a time" till we have only one untried thing left to us.—We must try that, or surrender, and there is no time to be lost.

The "one step at a time" of the "Republican" party, is a step backward—a retreat from the Free Soil platform, which, in its day, was a retreat from the ground of the Old Liberty party. "One step at a time" has brought us back to the foot of the hill.

But the maxim, as a rule of action, is not a sound one. It is contradicted by all Nature, all Revelation, all Philosophy, all History. As a record of fact, it may be true that great reforms are sometimes carried progressively. But that progression is not often the result of attempting only a partial reformation! The best and most successful efforts are those that are most direct, and that demand the whole reformation at once. The effects will be likely to be sufficiently gradual, peace-meal, and fragmentary, at best, but will generally be found proportioned in magnitude and value, to the directness, comprehensiveness and thoroughness of the blow that was struck to produce them. The true reformer, like Christ, and John the Baptist, lays the axe at the root of the tree, though the tree may not fall at once, but may only display withered branches. That result furnishes no argument in favor of striking at the branches, rather than at the root. Christianity demands sinless obedience in its converts. Yet their sanctification is only progressive. The fact does not establish the rule of attempting to crucify only one sin at a time, nor warrant the preaching or the practice of such an experiment! The preaching that should exhort sinners to repent of only one sin at a time, to quit swearing now, and thieving four years hence, would do little for the reformation of the world or for the salvation of souls. Earlier Christian reformers attempted piece-meal reformations, and well nigh failed. Luther and his associates struck for what they deemed a thorough Reformation, and accomplished vastly more. With more comprehensiveness they would have accomplished more still. The Puritans and the Quakers achieved their victories over evil, so far as they did achieve them, by striking directly and uncompromisingly at all the evils they then perceived. If they had perceived more, they would have struck at more, and accomplished more. Their mistakes and failures arose from this; not from their attempting too much good at one time, nor from attempting too many reforms at once, nor from being too uncompromising in their measures, nor from being too rigid in their adherence to their principles. All these were indeed imputed to them as faults, by their enemies, but the criticism was aimed at the very elements of their strength, under which the critics were writhing! When these elements declined, they declined, their victories ceased, and they became weak, as other men. Thus it was with the first Christians, and their successor, from the radical and uncompromising Paul, down through centuries to the temporizing and

time-serving Loyola. Christianity degenerated to Jesuitism, by the resistless force of the maxim that some sins are to be left undisturbed, on the condition that other sins are renounced. "Mankind are become so degenerate" (said the Jesuits) "that we cannot persuade them to give up all their evil practices at once. We must persuade them to take one step at a time."

The experiment of a Temperance Reformation on the "one step at a time" principle, was tried by the old Massachusetts Temperance Society from 1812 to 1827 without realizing an inch of progress. Then came the total abstinence societies, successful just in proportion to the thoroughness with which the true principle has been applied.

"One step at a time" was the maxim of those who thought to stop the African Slave Trade first, granting impunity to slaveholding, till the preliminary measure was first secured, as "a vantage ground." After a twenty years' struggle, a victory on paper, and nearly forty years' glorification of the achievement, it was ascertained by the British Parliament, that the "one step" had not begun to be taken, at all—that the matter-of-fact Slave Trade had not at all diminished. Not the first "one step" towards British West India Emancipation was taken until British Abolitionists raised the flag of "immediate and unconditional emancipation." By uniformly withholding their votes from all candidates for Parliament, who could not pronounce the "Shibboleth," they accomplished their object in a few years.

American Abolitionists commenced operations in 1833, under the same flag. So long as they remained faithful to it, so long they wielded a mighty power, for it was the power of God. When they began to waver, to accept offers of "half a loaf" as being "better than no bread;" "choosing the least of two evils;" acting with "the more favorable of the two;" "voting for Clay to keep out Texas;" for Satan to keep out sin; for Van Buren, to keep out political necromancy; (shall I add, for Fremont to discourage filibusterism?) they began to lose their own self-respect, their courage, and the confidence of their fellow-men. In 1836, the nation felt their footsteps, the political parties feared them, and all slavery trembled before them. In 1856, though boasting quadrupled numbers, the political parties, (including the Republican party,) ignore and despise them; slavery no longer stands on the defensive, but is riding over the free States and Territories rough shod. The only remaining "issue," the only remaining hope or effort is, that slavery may let the North alone, on condition that the North shall let slavery alone! On this issue, the Abolitionists, to a great extent, are eager to rush to the polls, and vote for the compromise! And this they justify, as being in accordance with the wise maxim of "attempting to take only one step at a time!" What step, in the same direction, could they take next?

As politics is but a branch of morals, so political success is dependent on the same conditions as is moral success, being but a phase of the same thing. In order to gain any great reform, a corresponding effort must be put forth. The reformer must demand, in the outset, the full length and breadth of what he intends to obtain, and he must be uncompromising in his demands. No important political reform, either in Great Britain or in this country, has ever been carried in any other way. The instances already cited in another connexion, as showing the power of minorities, are all in point, again, here. Minorities control majorities, or grow into majorities, not by timidly asking for a part of what they want, but by boldly demanding at the outset, the whole of it, and holding on till they get it. Thus the Barons extorted the Magna Charta from King John; thus the Puritans reclaimed English liberty from the clutches of Charles; thus our fathers recovered their liberties from the aggressions of George the third; thus the British Parliamentary Reform Bill, the Catholic Emancipation Bill, and all kindred reformatory measures in England have been obtained. In no instance has any thing been gained by asking for a fraction of what was wanted, instead of demanding the whole of it.

The merchant who wishes for a loan of a thousand dollars from his neighbor, does not begin by asking for one hundred in the first place, for a hundred more in the second place, and so on. The shrewd money borrower frequently asks for more than he needs, and

thus prepares the lender to part with the smaller sum that he does need. As a mere measure of policy, were there no principle involved, the Free-Soilers should have pressed directly for the abolition of Slavery, and then the "non-extension" they were seeking after, would have been greedily proffered them, by the slaveholders, as a "compromise." Most marvellous is it that, while acting upon the policy of "compromise," they should have forgotten all the tactics of compromise. All shrewd diplomacy, all thrifty bargain-making (if politics must needs be treated of, as standing in the same category) requires that the demand be placed high enough to leave room to recede largely, and yet leave "a living business operation" beneath it. The tin-peddler, the horse-dealer, the barterer of watches and trinkets (at least all over our Yankeedom) understands that he must put his price high enough to "fall" and yet drive a thrifty trade. Where the usage is to "split the difference," there, the greater the original difference, the more liberal the slice, after splitting. Between the "Radical Abolition" demand, and the demand of Senator Toombs, an even division line would strike, perhaps, as high as the Free-Soil platform, or higher. It could not fall so low as that of the Republican party. In the name, then, of Northern shrewdness, if we can rise no higher, let our representatives, when they must needs make bargains concerning human liberty, remember to deal as shrewdly as they would in selling a spavined horse. And let the voter, in his estimate of a political platform, observe the same rule. By this test, the "Republican" platform must be condemned by "practical business men." It leaves no room to "compromise" away a single inch more, without instant destruction.

To change the figure, the policy of the "Republican" charioteer is to drive his coach as near to the edge of the precipice as he can, and not run off; he calls on the spectators to bear witness that he "traverses the extreme verge" of his domain; he saves no margin; another inch, and he is dashed overboard; the high-way is sideling and slippery; and he is continually jostled by other vehicles, with whose drivers he is accustomed to divide the way by "compromise." The "Republican" coach threaded that brink the other day, when it permitted the passage of the Army Bill, and thereupon disappeared; some say it went overboard.

No reformatory party gets more than it asks for. The tendency of things, amid opposing influences, is, to get less. What a piece of folly to ask for less than the right—less than is needed! Most reforms and reformers fail in attempting too little. "Expect great things; attempt great things" was the missionary motto of Carey. "According to your faith be it unto you." "Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it." These are maxims for action, as well as for prayer. And so is the lesson of the unjust judge, and of the importunate widow. What a contrast to the policy of lowering down the demands of humanity and justice to the standard of partizan exigencies and Presidential availabilities!

ORIGIN OF SUCH MAXIMS.

And this suggests the very pertinent inquiry whether such maxims as those under review owe their origin to a tender regard for human progress and welfare, or whether they form a part of the tactics of manufacturing majorities and securing offices? I shall not shrink from the delicate task of broaching this inquiry. Too long have I witnessed, in silence, the heartless games in which the cause of liberty has been compromised. It is time to speak out plainly. Earnest men, intent on securing their professed objects, do not hazard them, for the sake of getting majorities. Earnest bank and tariff men; anti bank and anti-tariff men; earnest Republicans and earnest Federalists, in their day, never acted on maxims of this character. No cunning caucus-monger could catch their votes by proposing compromises of any sort. Their enthusiasm was kindled by appeals setting forth the impassable gulf, not the almost imperceptible and

trifling distance between their own position and that of their rivals. They cherished principles. They contended for measures—not for mere majorities and offices! Not until those issues became antiquated and obsolete, and nobody cared for them, was there any place found for political platforms of the modern style, shaped upon compromises and ambiguities, with the evident anxiety to depart as little as possible from the platform of the rival party; until, for instance, the Democratic "free trade" platform dwindled down to "a tariff for revenue with incidental protection," and the rival whig "protection" platform was "a tariff for protection on a revenue basis!" If, now, the issues between slavery and abolition have become stale and unmeaningless, if it be desirable to reach "the finale of all existing commotions" on the "plain of Ono," then the policy of frittering down the "issue" to the smallest possible point, on the plea of "attempting but one step at a time," is the very best device for the purpose, but not otherwise.

The marksman who would hit his game must never point his rifle below it. If he be indeed a marksman, he will make allowance for the force of gravitation and aim somewhat above it. The political and moral world has its gravitating forces, and if the moral aim, may not exceed the claims of truth, yet certainly it may not fall below them!

It is the truth that makes free:—not infinitesimal fractions of it, adapted to the exigencies of nominating conventions.

DISCLAIMING THE REAL INTENTION.

This policy of "carrying great principles and radical reforms, by attempting only one step at a time" arises very much from the supposed necessity of avoiding the odium that attaches to the whole measure, in its completeness. The real, ultimate object must be kept in the back ground—must be concealed—and even, if necessary, disclaimed.—By this means, it is said, reformers may gain the co-operation of those who are hostile to their main object. And since numbers are supposed to be the indispensable condition of success, it is necessary to act upon this policy.

So far has this maxim been carried by abolitionists who propose to co-operate with Republicans that I have known even Christian ministers to defend, as necessary and proper, the policy of the nominating convention, the candidate and the leaders of the party, in disclaiming any intention of interfering with slavery in the slave states. They will do this, while admitting the moral obligation, the constitutional right, and the political justice and necessity of a national abolition of American slavery. They declare their determination not to lose sight of that great object, and they say that their main motive in voting for Fremont, is, that they may gain a "vantage ground" from which to push forward the ultimate measure of abolition. Sometimes they will even attribute to Fremont himself and those who nominated him the same motive and policy. At any rate, they say it is their motive. And when pressed with the moral wrong of making such a pledge, they think to get rid of it by pleading that the promise is not intended to be kept. At first, perhaps, they will try to make it out that their vote for Fremont is not a vote for that pledge. But when driven out from that hiding place, they will place their defence upon the ground above stated! Thus they defend the expedients of falsification and deception as the necessary means of the "greatest amount of good." Others who will not say all this, in so many words, are apparently reposing upon something of that nature. They must "attempt but one thing at a time," and may wink at and tacitly endorse the disclaimer of any thing further. I do not indeed see how any "radical abolitionist" can vote for Fremont without, in reality, taking that position, or else giving up the design of abolishing slavery. Either their truthfulness and sincerity, or else their earnest abolitionism must, for aught I can see, suffer damage by the process, and, in my mind, it makes little difference which.—God does not require nor allow us to work out the abolition of slavery by such a process. Humanity and justice do not require nor permit it. God is not wont to honor such measures with his blessing. If, amid the mazes of his Providence,

the abolition of slavery should be brought about partly in connection with such efforts, that circumstance would not secure his divine approbation of them. Not even the victor is crowned except he strive lawfully. God needs not, humanity needs not—the 'doing of evil that good may come.' If it could be ascertained, before hand, (as it cannot) that the policy of falsification and deception would result in the abolition of slavery, that discovery of the result would not make the means lawful. In saying this, I repudiate that entire system of political ethics that sets reformers at work to calculate the probable results of a certain course of action, without stopping to enquire, in the first place, whether the proposed expedients are in harmony with the laws of fundamental morality. And I call attention to the fact that the manifestly corrupt maxim now under review, is the legitimate result of that entire scheme of policy which, in the whole of this letter I have been contending against.

Yet even this maxim has been attempted to be justified by an appeal to the example of Clarkson. In his zeal to secure the abolition of the African slave trade as "one step" towards the abolition of slavery, a "vantage ground" to stand upon, he sought to propitiate the slaveholders by showing them, at the same time, that the abolition of the slave trade would not disturb the tenure of slave property, nor lead to the abolition of slavery. Just as our "Republican" editors are commending their "platform" now. But the result of the policy is overlooked by those who approvingly refer to it—Granville Sharpe, from the first, protested against the policy, while the rest of the committee went for it. But Clarkson lived to discover and retract his error. His supposed abolition of the Slave trade turned out to be a complete failure, after a forty years' experiment! So that nothing was gained, (but that entire time and labor were lost) by the shrewd policy of "attempting to take but one step at a time"—disclaiming the ultimate object, in view! In his Providence, God signally blasted the expedient of concealment, in that case.

And the natural course of things does not favor the policy. "Simplicity and godly sincerity commend" themselves "to every man's conscience, in the sight of God;" they win respect, inspire confidence, and, in the long run, secure more reliable help from mere men of the world, in support of a good cause, than can be gained in any other way. And there is this difference to be noticed. In the one case, co-operation with worldly men, on the basis of corrupt maxims, brings Christian reformers down to their low level. In the other case, co-operation elevates worldly men towards the Christian standard, so far as outward acts and measures are concerned.

I find I have been led to occupy more than double the space I had intended, and yet I have not exhausted the subject. For the present I must close with the remark that all the other maxims of policy, adduced by those whose course I am opposing, are of the same character with those I have already considered.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

The first Annual Meeting of the American Abolition Society, for the election of officers and the transaction of other appropriate business, will be held at the Society's Rooms, No. 48 Beekman street, second floor, on Wednesday, October 22d, 1856, at ten o'clock, A. M. The Treasurer's account, and the Annual Report of the Executive Committee will be presented for the action of the Society.

By order of the Executive Committee,
WILLIAM GOODELL, Cor. Sec.

N. B.—No public meeting for Addresses is expected, until the customary time of holding anniversaries in May next.

Editors please copy.

NOTICE.

State and Electoral Tickets may be had by addressing Dr. JAMES FULLER, of Syracuse, N. Y.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1856.

For President,

GERRIT SMITH, OF NEW YORK.

For Vice-President,

SAMUEL MCFARLAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

NEW YORK STATE CONVENTION OF RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS.

A State Convention of the "Liberty Party," and also of "Radical Abolitionists" of the State of New York, agreeably to previous call, assembled at Market Hall, Syracuse, on Wednesday, September 17th, at 12 A. M.—Dr. James Fuller of Syracuse was chosen Chairman, and Wm. W. Chapman of Oswego Co., Secretary. Prayer was offered by M. B. Williams, of Washington Co. A Business Committee was appointed, consisting of Wm. Goodell of Brooklyn, James C. Harrington of Oswego Co., and M. B. Williams of Washington Co., to report resolutions.—A series of resolutions was reported by the said Committee and subsequently adopted. The following Committees were also appointed.—On Finances, J. M. Le Baron of Saratoga, R. W. Lyman, Wyoming, Otis Simmons of Madison.—On Roll List, S. H. Taft of Jefferson, Seymour Coe of Oswego, C. M. Waterman of Oneida.—On Nominations M. B. Williams, J. C. Harrington, Apollos Smith.—On Publication—James Fuller, Montgomery Merrick.—State Central Committee, Wm. W. Chapman, James C. Harrington, Otis Simmons.

AFTERNOON AND EVENING SESSION.

The following State officers were nominated.—For Governor, William Goodell, of Kings Co.—For Lieut. Governor, Austin Ward, of Oneida Co.—For Canal Commissioner, James C. Harrington, of Oswego Co.—For State Prison Inspector, Wm. W. Chapman, of Oswego Co. For Clerk of Court of Appeals, Chas. D. B. Mills of Onondaga Co.

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.

Electors at large, Simeon S. Jocelyn of Kings Co. and James Fuller of Onondaga Co.—Other Electors.—James McCune Smith, Wm. W. Chapman, James C. Harrington, Jacob Kendall, Hiram Gilbert, Seymour Coe, Hiram B. Lewis, Charles Barstow, Apollos Smith, Charles D. B. Mills, James Le Baron, Samuel Salisbury, Montgomery Merrick, Lucius J. Ormsbee, Noble O. Ruggles, James Marwick, John W. Hill, Robert Pike, Jeremiah Coons, Aaron Stedman, C. M. Waterman, Reuben Wilcox, John Wait, Elisha Allis, Edward A. Hunt, William Day, Otis Simmons, Wright Clapp, Ralston W. Lyman, George Candee, Insley Douglass, Nelson A. Frost, Marcus Stickney.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.

1. Resolved, That the one great mission of civil government is to "execute justice" to protect all the natural, equal, and inalienable rights of all men, and neither to infringe nor to permit the violation of any one of them.

2. That in the fulfillment of this mission, in this nation, at the present crisis, the first, the paramount, the most immediately pressing measure, for a national administration, is the prompt and total abolition of American Slavery.

3. That since the "Democratic," the "American" and the "Republican" parties, notwithstanding all their minor disagreements, agree with each other on the main issue, ignoring the first principles of civil government, refusing to "execute justice" and protect the equal rights of all men, by the abolition of slavery, we entreat all who fear God, regard man, or desire national deliverance, to avoid the sin and folly of sustaining either one of those parties or voting for their candidates.

4. That the proposal of the Republican party to protect freedom in Kansas by a course of policy which involves the protection of slavery in the states whose slaveholders are invading and enslaving Kansas, is a proposal which commands neither our confidence, our respect, or our co-operation, because we do not believe that freedom in Kansas can be thus secured, nor that if it could, we should have any moral right to build the superstructure of "freedom-in-Kansas" upon the foundation of protected slavery, in other states.

5. That we cannot confide in, nor co-operate with the "Republican" party, because we hold that the aggressions of slavery, are inseparable from the existence of slavery,—that slavery extension can be stopped only by slavery extinction; that the divine retribution now coming upon us for our great national sin is to be stayed, not by a renewed pledge for its continuance, but only by its speedy abandonment.

Convention adjourned sine die.

JAMES FULLER, President.

WM. W. CHAPMAN, Secretary.

For the Radical Abolitionist.

MISSION OF THE DEMOCRACY.

BROTHER GOODELL:—If you can, do find room in your Oct. No., for the following precious extract.

Yours, VIATOR.

"It is the mission of the Democracy to proclaim and maintain the great doctrines of civil and religious liberty, and to uphold and enforce the Constitution in its sublime principles of justice and equality."—National Democratic Convention, ("Hard Shell") Syracuse, N. Y., Aug. 23, 1856.

[To the above, we add the following:—Ed.]

"OTTAWA, Ill., Aug. 14.

"The argument here used to secure votes for the Democratic party, from the foreign population, is, that the Democrats are opposed to slavery, and that Buchanan will do all he can to suppress it."

John Van Buren, it is said, is stumping for Buchanan, in Ohio, and the burden of his speeches is, that the Democratic party is the party for non-extension! With this, he probably expects to offset the "Republican" movement upon the "Henry Clay Platform!"

For the Radical Abolitionist.

THE PLAIN FACT.

A zealous Republican said to a lecturer, "Explain to the people that this Republican party is not like the old Abolition party, which had the abolition of slavery for its object,—our party has nothing to do with that object."

Sept. 8th, 1856.

VIATOR.

For the Radical Abolitionist.

TO THE RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS OF ILLINOIS.

At the State Convention of Radical Abolitionists held at Juliet, July 31st, 1856, the undersigned was chosen a committee to procure and distribute printed tickets; I therefore request that the Abolitionists of the several Counties will inform me how many tickets are needed in their respective Counties, and they will be forwarded by mail. As no State Officers were nominated, there will be simply the Electoral ticket, with blanks for State and County Officers.

Address H. H. HIMMAN, Pontiac, Livingston County, Illinois.

Sept. 1st, 1856.

H. H. HIMMAN.

TO THE RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS OF MICHIGAN.

You are invited to meet at the "City Hotel," in DETROIT, on Thursday the 2d day of October, at 10 o'clock, A. M., to nominate Electors to vote for GERRIT SMITH, for President, and SAMUEL MCFARLAND for Vice President of the United States.

By order of the National Committee.

C. C. FOOTE,

Member of the Committee for Michigan.

Detroit, Sept. 10, 1856.

[The above notice did not reach in season for our last number.]

ITEMS.

"Till America comes into this measure" [the Abolition of American Slavery] "her prayers to Heaven will be impious." John Jay, 1780.

But Col. Fremont and his party are "inflexibly opposed" to this measure.

THE "POLITICAL ABOLITIONIST."—This is the name of a new weekly paper by W. A. HUNTER, Bryan, Williams, & Co., Ohio, at \$1 per annum in advance. It ably advocates the doctrines of Radical Abolition. Success to it.

"THE REFORMER," by A. Pryne, Ravenna, Ohio, a religious and miscellaneous newspaper, weekly, at \$1 50 in advance, maintains that the Constitution is an anti-slavery document, authorising the abolition of slavery in the entire nation. It also opposes rum-selling, and secret political associations, and advocates carrying these political principles to the ballot-box, on all occasions.

A NAMESAKE.—We have received a "Radical Abolitionist," Vol. 1, No. 1, dated Warren, Pa., Sept., 1856, with the flag of Gerrit Smith, for President, and Samuel McFarland, for Vice President. It contains the proceedings of the Warren Co. Radical Convention, which appeared in our last, and also of the adjourned meeting, Sept. 3, at which, spirited resolutions were adopted for supporting the nominees of the Radical Abolitionists. The paper is printed on a single page, perhaps only as a handbill. If continued, we suggest a variation of the name, to prevent confusion. Go ahead!

Senator Trumbull, a supporter of Fremont, says that if Fremont is elected, it will be the termination of the anti-slavery excitement in this country.

"The Union shall be kept, by making the Union free, the union of freemen forever."—W. H. Channing, (vide N. Y. Daily Tribune, July 24.)

But this will require a different platform from that of the Republican party.

RADICAL ABOLITIONIST.

CIRCULAR OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

To the Abolitionists of the United States:

The National Abolition Convention, assembled at Syracuse, N. Y., May 28th and 29th, 1856, having nominated Gerrit Smith of N. York for President, and Samuel McFarland, of Pennsylvania for Vice-President of the United States, appointed the undersigned a National Committee, to promote the objects of said Convention. It is earnestly recommended, by the National Convention, that State Conventions of abolitionists in favor of said nominations, be held as soon as possible, in each state, to select presidential electors for the several districts, and to take efficient measures for printing and distributing tickets, and otherwise laboring to secure their election. The time and place of holding said Conventions in each state, will be designated and notified by the member of this committee residing in the state. In states wherein no member of this Committee resides, the friends of the cause will please consult and notify a State Convention. Every thing, almost, depends upon the local activity and vigilance of the friends of the cause, in the different states, counties, towns, cities and villages.

WILLIAM GOODELL, of New York,
Chairman of the Committee.

THOMAS CUSHING, Maine.
DANIEL FOSTER, Massachusetts.
JOHN R. FOREST, Vermont.
A. G. BEMAN, Connecticut.
A. B. BURDICK, Rhode Island.
ARTHUR TAPPAN, New Jersey.
GEORGE F. HORTON, Pennsylvania.
A. PRYNE, Ohio.
C. C. FOOTE, Michigan.
H. O. WAGONER, Illinois.
L. P. FROST, Wisconsin.
S. M. BELL, Virginia.

Letters, and remittances for the National Committee, (including subscriptions made at the National Nominating Convention at Syracuse) should be directed to the chairman of the Committee, William Goodell, Box 1212, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York. All the funds furnished will be promptly and faithfully expended to carry on the campaign vigorously, by circulating publications, and otherwise.

Publications of the American Reform Tract and Book Society, for sale at this office.

- TRACTS No. 1. Separation from Sin and Sinners, 24 pages.
2. Hebrew Servitude and American Slavery compared 8 pp.
3. Premium Tract on Slavery, 24 pp.
4. Agitation, the Doom of Slavery, 16 pp.
5. Slavery and the Bible, 12 pp.
6. The Bible gives no sanction to Slavery, by a Tennesseean, 32 pp.
7. Sale of a Family of Slaves in Washington, D. C. 4 pp.
8. What is the Maine Law? 8 pp.
9. The Little Coat, 8 pp.
10. The Duty of Voting for Righteous Men, 8 pp.
11. The Corn Question, 8 pp.
12. Why the sale of intoxicating drinks should be prohibited, 4 pp.
13. What it is to preach the Gospel, 24 pp.
14. Colonization Wrong, by John G. Fee, 48 pp.
15. Fellowship with Slavery, 32 pp.
16. Is it expedient to introduce Slavery into Kansas? 24 pp.
17. Earthly Care a Heavenly Discipline, 8 pp. The same on 16 pp. 64mo.
18. The Three Dangers, or Read, Watch and Pray, 8 pp.
19. Pleas for Slavery Answered, 24 pp.
Fifteen hundred pages for one dollar, or twelve hundred sent by mail, postage prepaid.
- THE SINNER'S FRIEND.
A reprint, more than fifteen hundred thousand copies of which have been published in twenty-three different languages, '32 pp. paper cover 3 cts.
- EVIDENCES ON THE SLAVE TRADE.
A reprint of Evidence delivered before a select committee of the House of Commons in the years 1790-91, on the part of petitioners for the abolition of the slave trade. 12mo. 117 pp. cloth, price 25cts.
- COVENANT OF GRACE.
A practical work, designed to promote family religion, by Rev. John Rankin, 160 pp. 18 mo. cloth 20 cts.
- Sabbath school books, 18mo cloth.
The power of Prayer, by Charles Morley 8 cents
A Memoir of Samuel Donnell, by John Rankin 10 "
The Edmundson family, by Mrs H B Stowe 12 "
Letters to Sabbath School children on Africa 25 "
Memoir of Rev Levi Spencer 30 "
Gertrude Lee, or the Northern Cousin 25 "
Harriet and Ellen, or the Orphan Girls 25 "
Walter Browning, or the Slave's Protector 20 "
Gospel Fruits, or Bible Christianity Illustrated, a Premium Essay, 188 pp. with plates 35 "

GENERAL CATALOGUE OF BOOKS PAMPHLETS, &c.

For sale at the Abolition Depository, 48 Beekman St. New York. Terms Cash.

Those who send money for books to be sent by mail, will please add the postage. Orders to be addressed to William Goodell, 48 Beekman Street, N. Y.

BOOKS.	Wholesale.	Retail.	Postage.
American Slave Code, by William Goodell	\$ 50	75	17
Autographs for Freedom	63	1 00	12
Bible Servitude—E Smith of Ohio	40	50	10
Barnes on Slavery	31	50	15
Brisbane " " " " " "	18	38	5
Chaplet The—by E H C	25	38	8
Congregationalism and Church Action—by John Keep	18	25	4
Democracy of Christianity, by Wm. Goodell in two vols.	1 00	1 50	32
Evidence on the Slave Trade	22	25	6
Facts for Baptist Churches	66	75	12
Freeman's (O. S.) Letters on Slavery, a very valuable work	28	38	5
Gospel Fruits—a premium Essay—by Mrs. Maria Goodell Frost	20	25	3
rosvenor's Review of Fuller and Wayland	31	35	7
Higher Law—by Wm Hosmer, with Portrait of Ex-Gov Seward	18	25	4
Jay's Miscellaneous Writings, containing Judge Jay's principal Anti-Slavery Works*	40	50	10
Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin	75	1 00	27
Law and Government—By Harmon Kingsbury	60	75	20
Letters on Africa, by Geo Thompson	38	50	10
Memoir of Levi Spencer, by J Blanchard	27	30	6
Phelps' Letters to Stowe and Bacon	22	25	6
Pilgrim of Ninety Years—(Mrs Kiah Bayley) gilt	28	38	8
Proceedings of Anti Slavery Convention 1841 & 43	38	50	8
Review of the Mexican War, by Jay	56	75	15
Slave Trade—Domestic and Foreign—By H C Carey	75	1 00	15
Slavery and Anti Slav, Histy of—By Goodell	75	1 00	30
Thompson (Andrew) on Slavery—Edinburgh Edition	18	25	6
Tribute to the Negro. Vindication of their Moral, Intellectual, and Religious Capabilities	80	1 00	38
Unconstitutionality of Slavery—Spooner	56	75	12

PAMPHLETS.

Abolition Documents No. 1 per hundred.	6	25	5
Amanda—A Tale by Dr Brisbane	6	10	2
American Slavery, a formidable obstacle to the conversion of the World—Prize Essay by Wm Goodell	3	6	1
American Slavery and American Christianity containing Dr Perkins' Sermon, Jay on Tract Society, Jay on American Missionary Association, and Letter on Dropping a Book from the Catalogue of the American Sunday School Union	6	10	2
Am. Tract Soc. Apologies, Review of Anti Slavery Manual—By John G Fee	15	25	5
Black Code of District of Columbia	19	25	3
Calumny refuted by Facts from Liberia	5	7	1
Cassius M Clay's Appeal to Christians	1-2	1	1
Caulkin's Narrative	3	5	1
Chase's (now Gov) Argument in Defence of Van Zandt	12	18	5
Christian's Business—By Geo Thompson, of Africa	2	3	1
Conditions of Living—By James C Jackson	1-2	1	1
Constitutional Duty of the Federal Government to abolish Slavery	2	2	1
Const'n U. S. with a Lecture by D. L. Foster	8	10	3
Constitution of the U. S.—All the Acts of Congress relating to Slavery, &c.	9	15	2
Documents—Fugitive Slave Bill, &c. &c. &c.	1	2	1
Facts and Opinions on Colonization Society; its Real Origin, Character and Influence	31	37	8
Facts in Life of Gen. Taylor	4	6	1
"Fanatic"—Perils of Peter Pliant	6	10	2
Free Mission Principle—By Edwin R Warren	2	3	1
Fugitive Slave Law—By Rev Joseph P Thompson	6	8	2
Granger's Speech on the Constitution	1	2	1
Great Issue—History of Free Soil Question	6	10	6
Headlands in Life of Henry Clay	1	2	1
History of Division in Anti Slavery Societies	4	6	1
Holley (Myron) History of Monument	4	6	1
Law versus Slavery	1	1	1
Liberty Tracts—per hundred	50cts	per hundred	
Life of Lovejoy	28	37	9
Mosaic Laws of Servitude—By Judge Jay	8	12	3
Paper presented to General Anti Slavery Convention	18	25	4
Parker and Root's Discussion	1	2	1
Platforms The, of Political Parties	1	2	1
Politics and the Pulpit, from Journal of Commerce and Independent	7	10	2
Proceedings of the Syracuse Convention	3	6	1
Remonstrance of Evangelical Alliance	4	6	1
Remedy for Duelling	1	2	1
Reproof of the American Church—By Bishop of Oxford	6	10	3
Report of Committee of Congregational Ministers of Mass.	3	6	1
" of Am. & For. Anti Slavery Society for 1847, & 52	8	12	2
1849-50-51 & 53	18	25	3
Reviewer Reviewed—By Chas G Finney	6	10	3
Sabbath Scene—By Whittier	12	18	2
Scriptural Argument—McKeen's	5	8	1
Sinfulness of Slaveholding—J. G. Fee	2	3	1
Slave Catcher Caught—By Asa Rand	8	12	2
Slaveholding proved to be just and right	1-2	1	1
South Bend Fugitive Slave Case	4	6	1
Spiritual Manifestations—Beecher	12	18	2
Tobacco Tract—Alcott & Grimshaw	3	5	1
Uncle Tom's Cabin—in German,	38	60	10

SPEECHES.

Address to Anti Slavery Christians	5	8	1
" of Colored Citizens of New York per hundred	4	25	5
Beecher on the Fugitive Slave Law	4	6	1

* In the National Era, the price was advertised somewhat lower, but considering the size and value of the book, it cannot be afforded less than these prices.

	Wholesale	Retail	Postage
Calhoun	1	2	1
Canada and Jamaica	1	2	1
Debates in Congress	4	6	1
Douglass' Oration	6	10	2
Giddings on Baltimore Platforms	1	2	1
Julian	1	2	1
Just Rulers—Couch	1	2	1
Landmark of Freedom—Sumner	18	25	5
Mann on the Slave Trade	1	2	1
Mass. Liberty Convention	1	2	1
Perkins "Our Country's Sin"	4	6	1
Seward on California	6	10	1
South and North	2	3	1
Sumner's "Freedom, National—Slavery Sectional"	2	3	1
" before American Peace Society	8	12	2
Stevens on California	1	2	1
Southern and Western Liberty Convention	2	3	1
Townshend	1	2	1

LETTERS.

Clarke (John) to J. Sturge on Jamaica	1	2	1
Channing to Clay	2	3	1
Jay to Frelinghuysen	1	2	1
" Nelson	2	3	1
" Silliman Ives	4	6	1
Phelps " Stowe and Bacon	18	25	3

ENGRAVINGS.

Bibb, Henry	18	25	6
Birney James G.	18	25	6
Cinque	20	25	6
Clarkson Thomas	18	25	6
Hale John P	38	50	6
Lundy, Benjamin	18	25	6
Stowe, Harriet Beecher	60	75	8
Conquering prejudices to save the Union	10	15	3
Effects of the Fugitive Slave Law	8	12	3
Nubian Slave	12	18	4
Little Eva	60	75	10

MUSIC.

18	25	3
----	----	---

SPECIAL LIST.

- The following (included in the preceding catalogue) are specially adapted to define and vindicate the distinctive principles and measures of the American Abolition Society, viz.
1. "PROCEEDINGS OF THE SYRACUSE CONVENTION."—The balance of the second edition, about 600 copies, will be furnished, singly, to each person sending a three cent post office stamp, to prepay the postage. This offer is made to hasten and equalize the circulation, and accommodate those of small means. "First come—first served."
 2. "THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT to abolish American Slavery: an expose of the position of the Abolition Society of New York city and vicinity." 18 pages, 18mo. 2 cts
 3. ABOLITION DOCUMENTS. No. 1. PRINCIPLES AND MEASURES. Declaration of the Convention of Radical Political Abolitionists at Syracuse. 2 pages, of the size and form of Congressional Documents. Price 25 cents per hundred.
 4. Spooner's "Unconstitutionality of Slavery." First and Second Part, and Defence of Fugitive Slaves, with Appendix. 294 pp. 8vo. in paper—is now for sale at this office, at 75 cents, or postage prepaid 86 cents.
 5. LETTERS ON SLAVERY. [By O. S. Freeman.] "Addressed to pro-slavery men in America, showing its illegality in all ages and nations, its destructive war upon society and government, morals and religion." 108 pp. Price 25 cents in paper, or 37 1-2 in cloth.
 6. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, with a LECTURE by Daniel Foster. Showing that a fair interpretation and application of said Constitution will abolish Slavery and establish Liberty. 62 pp. Price ten cents.
 7. ABOLITION DOCUMENTS, No. 2. The Constitution against Slavery. Speech of Gen. Granger in Congress. Retail price two cents, or one dollar per hundred. Postage one cent.
 8. ABOLITION DOCUMENTS, No. 3. Law versus Slavery. (Extracts from eminent writers on Law.) Retail price one cent, or fifty cents per hundred. Postage one cent per ounce.

WRITINGS

OF
WILLIAM GOODELL.
(Included in the preceding catalogue.)

THE DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, &c. &c.
In 2 vols. 12mo, pp. 871. Price, \$1.50. Postage pre-paid, \$1.80.
This work is recommended by Rev. Dr. Aydelotte, late President of Woodward College, Ohio. Hon. Amasa Walker, late Secretary of State, Massachusetts, Prof. T. B. Hudson, Oberlin College, and Rev. E. Smith, Mansfield, Ohio: also by the New York Tribune, New York Evangelist, and other periodicals.

SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY.

A history of the great struggle in both Hemispheres, with a view of the Slavery-question in the United States. Pp. 606, royal 12mo. Price \$1. Postage pre-paid \$1.30.
This work is designed to embody a great amount of historical information in a single volume, conveniently arranged for reference. It contains fifty chapters, on as many distinct topics, embracing the most important facts in the political and ecclesiastical history of the England and the United States, up to the present time: the divisions among them; and closing with a brief discussion of the question, "What ought to be done?" The book is an abstract of several great part of which has never before been collected into any volume. Contents and a copious alphabetical index will facilitate a reference to particular facts and to dates, when desirable.

THE AMERICAN SLAVE-CODE, IN THEORY AND PRACTICE.

Its Distinctive Features shown by its Statutes, Judicial Decisions, and illustrative facts. Pp. 430. 12mo. Price 75 cents. Postage pre paid, 92.
(From Hon. WILLIAM JAY to the author.)
"Your analysis of the Slave laws is very able, and your exhibition of their practical application by the Southern Courts evinces great and careful research. . . . It is more easy to make than to refute a charge of exaggeration against a work of fiction, like Mrs. Stowe's; but your book is as impregnable against such a charge as Euclid's Geometry, since, like that, it consists of propositions and demonstrations. The book is not only true, but it is unquestionable true."

AMERICAN SLAVERY A FORMIDABLE OBSTACLE TO THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

A prize Tract of 24 pages. Price \$3 per 100.
Address WM. GOODELL, 48 Beekman street New York.

TOBITT'S COMBINATION-TYPE, 181 WILLIAM ST.

CIRCULAR OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

To the Abolitionists of the United States:

The National Abolition Convention, assembled at Syracuse, N. Y., May 28th and 29th, 1856, having nominated Gerrit Smith of N. York for President, and Samuel McFarland, of Pennsylvania for Vice-President of the United States, appointed the undersigned a National Committee, to promote the objects of said Convention.

It is earnestly recommended, by the National Convention, that State Conventions of abolitionists in favor of said nominations, be held as soon as possible, in each state, to select presidential electors for the several districts, and to take efficient measures for printing and distributing tickets, and otherwise laboring to secure their election. The time and place of holding said Conventions in each state, will be designated and notified by the member of this committee residing in the state. In states wherein no member of this Committee resides, the friends of the cause will please consult and notify a State Convention. Every thing, almost, depends upon the local activity and vigilance of the friends of the cause, in the different states, counties, towns, cities and villages.

WILLIAM GOODELL, of New York,
Chairman of the Committee.

THOMAS CUSHING, Maine.
DANIEL FOSTER, Massachusetts.
JOHN R. FOREST, Vermont.
A. G. BEMAN, Connecticut.
A. B. BURDICK, Rhode Island.
ARTHUR TAPPAN, New Jersey.
GEORGE F. HORTON, Pennsylvania.
A. PRYNE, Ohio.
C. C. FOOTE, Michigan.
H. O. WAGONER, Illinois.
L. P. FROST, Wisconsin.
S. M. BELL, Virginia.

Letters, and remittances for the National Committee, (including subscriptions made at the National Nominating Convention at Syracuse) should be directed to the chairman of the Committee, William Goodell, Box 1212, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York. All the funds furnished will be promptly and faithfully expended to carry on the campaign vigorously, by circulating publications, and otherwise.

Publications of the American Reform Tract and Book Society, for sale at this office.

- TRACTS No. 1. Separation from Sin and Sinners, 24 pages.
2. Hebrew Servitude and American Slavery compared 8 pp.
3. Premium Tract on Slavery, 24 pp.
4. Agitation, the Doom of Slavery, 16 pp.
5. Slavery and the Bible, 12 pp.
6. The Bible gives no sanction to Slavery, by a Tennesseean, 32 pp.
7. Sale of a Family of Slaves in Washington, D. C. 4 pp.
8. What is the Maine Law? 8 pp.
9. The Little Coat, 8 pp.
10. The Duty of Voting for Righteous Men, 8 pp.
11. The Corn Question, 8 pp.
12. Why the sale of intoxicating drinks should be prohibited, 4 pp.
13. What it is to preach the Gospel, 24 pp.
14. Colonization Wrong, by John G. Fee, 48 pp.
15. Fellowship with Slavery, 32 pp.
16. Is it expedient to introduce Slavery into Kansas? 24 pp.
17. Earthly Care a Heavenly Discipline, 8 pp. The same on 16 pp. 64mo.
18. The Three Dangers, or Read, Watch and Pray, 8 pp.
19. Pleas for Slavery Answered, 24 pp.

Fifteen hundred pages for one dollar, or twelve hundred sent by mail, postage prepaid.

THE SINNER'S FRIEND.

A reprint, more than fifteen hundred thousand copies of which have been published in twenty-three different languages, 32 pp. paper cover 3 cts.

EVIDENCES ON THE SLAVE TRADE.

A reprint of Evidence delivered before a select committee of the House of Commons in the years 1790-91, on the part of petitioners for the abolition of the slave trade. 12mo. 117 pp. cloth, price 25cts.

COVENANT OF GRACE.

A practical work, designed to promote family religion, by Rev. John Rankin, 169 pp. 18 mo. cloth 20 cts.

Sabbath school books, 18mo. cloth.

The power of Prayer, by Charles Morley 8 cents
A Memoir of Samuel Doane, by John Rankin 10 "
The Edmundson family, by Mrs. H. B. Stowe 12 "
Letters to Sabbath School children on Africa 25 "
Memoir of Rev. Levi Spencer 30 "
Gertrude Lee, or the Northern Cousin 25 "
Harriet and Ellen, or the Orphan Girls 25 "
Walter Browning, or the Slave's Protector 20 "
Gospel Fruits, or Bible Christianity Illustrated, a Premium Essay, 188 pp. with plates 35 "

**GENERAL CATALOGUE OF BOOKS
PAMPHLETS, &c.**

For sale at the Abolition Depository, 48
Beekman St. New York. Terms Cash.

Those who send money for books to be sent by mail, will please add the postage. Orders to be addressed to "William Goodell, 48 Beekman Street, N. Y."

BOOKS.

	Wholesale.	Retail.	Postage.
American Slave Code, by William Goodell	\$ 50	\$ 75	17
Autographs for Freedom	63	1 00	12
Bible Servitude—E. Smith of Ohio	40	50	10
Barnes on Slavery	40	50	15
Brisbane " " In Cloth	31	38	5
" " " Paper	18	25	4
Chaplet The—by E. H. C.	25	38	8
Congregationalism and Church Action—by John Keep	18	25	4
Democracy of Christianity, by Wm. Goodell in two vols.	1 00	1 50	32
Evidence on the Slave Trade	22	25	6
Facts for Baptist Churches	56	75	12
Freeman's (O. S.) Letters on Slavery, a very valuable work	28	38	5
" " " in paper	20	25	3
Gospel Fruits—a premium Essay—by Mrs. Maria Goodell Frost	31	35	7
rosvenor's Review of Fuller and Wayland	25	37	6
" " " in paper	18	25	4
Higher Law—by Wm. Hosmer, with Portrait of Ex-Gov. Seward	40	50	10
Jay's Miscellaneous Writings, containing Judge Jay's principal Anti-Slavery Works*	75	1 00	27
Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin in cloth	60	75	20
" " " paper	40	50	14
Law and Government—By Harmon Kingsbury	38	50	10
Letters on Africa, by Geo. Thompson	27	30	6
Memoir of Levi Spencer, by J. Blanchard	22	25	6
Phelps' Letters to Stowe and Bacon	28	38	9
Pilgrim of Ninety Years—(Mrs. Kiah Bayley) gilt	28	38	8
Proceedings of Anti Slavery Convention 1841 & 43	38	50	18
Review of the Mexican War, by Jay	56	75	15
Slave Trade—Domestic and Foreign—By H. C. Carey	75	1 00	15
Slavery and Anti Slav. Hist. of—By Goodell	75	1 00	30
Thompson (Andrew) on Slavery—Edinburgh Edition	18	25	6
Tribute to the Negro. Vindication of their Moral, Intellectual, and Religious Capabilities	80	1 00	38
Unconstitutionality of Slavery—Spooner	56	75	12

PAMPHLETS.

Abolition Documents No. 1 per hundred.	25	5
Amanda—A Tale by Dr. Brisbane	6	10
American Slavery, a formidable obstacle to the conversion of the World—Prize Essay by Wm. Goodell	3	6
American Slavery and American Christianity—containing Dr. Perkins' Sermon, Jay on Tract Society, Jay on American Missionary Association, and Letter on Dropping a Book from the Catalogue of the American Sunday School Union	6	10
Am. Tract Soc. Apologies, Review of Anti Slavery Manual—By John G. Fee	4	5
Black Code of District of Columbia	15	25
Calumny refuted by Facts from Liberia	19	25
Cassius M. Clay's Appeal to Christians	6	7
Caution's Narrative	1-2	1
Chase's (now Gov.) Argument in Defence of Van Zandt	3	5
Christian's Business—By Geo. Thompson, of Africa	12	18
Conditions of Living—By James C. Jackson	2	3
Constitutional Duty of the Federal Government to abolish Slavery	1-2	1
Const'n U. S. with a Lecture by D. L. Foster	2	3
Constitution of the U. S.—All the Acts of Congress relating to Slavery, &c.	8	10
Documents—Fugitive Slave Bill, &c., &c., &c.	9	15
Facts and Opinions on Colonization Society; its Real Origin, Character and Influence	1	2
Facts in Life of Gen. Taylor	31	37
"Fanatic"—Perils of Peter Pliant	4	6
Free Mission Principle—By Edwin R. Warren	6	10
Fugitive Slave Law—By Rev. Joseph P. Thompson	2	3
Granger's Speech on the Constitution	6	8
Great Issue—History of Free Soil Question	1	2
Headlands in Life of Henry Clay	6	10
History of Division in Anti Slavery Societies	1	2
Holley (Myron) History of Monument	4	6
Law versus Slavery 50cts per hundred	1	1
Liberty Tracts—per hundred	28	37
Life of Lovejoy	8	12
Mosaic Laws of Servitude—By Judge Jay	1	1
Paper presented to General Anti Slavery Convention	18	25
Parker and Root's Discussion	1	2
Platforms The, of Political Parties	7	10
Politics and the Pulpit, from Journal of Commerce and Independent	3	6
Proceedings of the Syracuse Convention	4	6
Remonstrance of Evangelical Alliance	1	2
Remedy for Duelling	6	10
Reproof of the American Church—By Bishop of Oxford	3	6
Report of Committee of Congregational Ministers of Mass.	8	12
" of Am. & For. Anti Slavery Society for 1847, & 52	18	25
" " " " for 1849-50-51 & 53	6	10
Reviewer Reviewed—By Chas. G. Finney	12	18
Sabbath Scene—By Whittier	5	8
Scriptural Argument—McKeen's	2	3
Sinfulness of Slaveholding—J. G. Fee	8	12
Slave Catcher Caught—By Asa Rand	1-2	1
Slaveholding proved to be just and right	4	6
South Bend Fugitive Slave Case	12	18
Spiritual Manifestations—Beecher	3	5
Tobacco Tract—Alcott & Grimshaw	38	50
Uncle Tom's Cabin—in German		

SPEECHES.

Address to Anti Slavery Christians	5	8	1
" of Colored Citizens of New York per hundred		25	5
Beecher on the Fugitive Slave Law	4	6	1

* In the National Era, the price was advertised somewhat lower, but considering the size and value of the book, it cannot be afforded less than these prices.

Wholesale Retail Postage
pre paid

Calhoun	1	2	1
Canada and Jamaica	1	2	1
Debates in Congress	4	6	1
Douglass' Oration	6	10	2
Giddings on Baltimore Platforms	1	2	1
Julian	1	2	1
Just Rulers—Couch	1	2	1
Landmark of Freedom—Sumner	18	25	5
Mann on the Slave Trade	1	2	1
Mass. Liberty Convention	1	2	1
Perkins "Our Country's Sin"	4	6	1
Seward on California	6	10	1
South and North	2	3	1
Sumner's "Freedom, National—Slavery Sectional"	2	3	1
" before American Peace Society	8	12	2
Stevens on California	1	2	1
Southern and Western Liberty Convention	2	3	1
Townshend	1	2	1

LETTERS.

Clarke (John) to J. Sturge on Jamaica	1	2	1
Channing to Clay	2	3	1
Jay to Frelinghuysen	1	2	1
" Nelson	2	3	1
" Silliman Ives	4	6	1
Phelps " Stowe and Bacon	18	25	3

ENGRAVINGS.

Bibb, Henry	18	25	6
Birney James G.	18	25	6
Cinque	20	25	6
Clarkson Thomas	18	25	6
Hale John P.	38	50	6
Lundy, Benjamin	18	25	6
Stowe, Harriet Beecher	60	75	8
Conquering prejudices to save the Union	10	15	3
" "	8	12	3
Effects of the Fugitive Slave Law	12	18	4
Nubian Slave	60	75	10

MUSIC.

Little Eva	18	25	3
------------	----	----	---

SPECIAL LIST.

The following (included in the preceding catalogue) are specially adapted to define and vindicate the distinctive principles and measures of the American Abolition Society, viz.

1. "PROCEEDINGS OF THE SYRACUSE CONVENTION."—The balance of the second edition, about 600 copies, will be furnished, singly, to each person sending a three cent post office stamp, to prepay the postage. This offer is made to hasten and equalize the circulation, and accommodate those of small means. "First come—first served."
2. "THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ABOLISH AMERICAN SLAVERY: an expose of the position of the Abolition Society of New York city and vicinity. 18 pages, 18mo., 2 cts."
3. ABOLITION DOCUMENTS. No. 1. PRINCIPLES AND MEASURES. Declaration of the Convention of Radical Political Abolitionists at Syracuse. 2 pages, of the size and form of Congressional Documents. Price 25 cents per hundred.
4. Spooner's "Unconstitutionality of Slavery," First and Second Part, and Defence of Fugitive Slaves, with Appendix. 294 pp. 8vo. in paper—is now for sale at this office, at 75 cents, or postage prepaid 86 cents.
5. LETTERS ON SLAVERY. [By O. S. Freeman.] "Addressed to pro-slavery men in America, showing its illegality in all ages and nations, its destructive war upon society and government, morals and religion." 108 pp. Price 25 cents in paper, or 37 1/2 in cloth.
6. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, with a LECTURE by Daniel Foster. Showing that a fair interpretation and application of said Constitution will abolish Slavery and establish Liberty. 62 pp. Price ten cents.
7. ABOLITION DOCUMENTS, No. 2. The Constitution against Slavery. Speech of Gen. Granger in Congress. Retail price two cents, or one dollar per hundred. Postage one cent.
8. ABOLITION DOCUMENTS, No. 3. Law versus Slavery. (Extracts from eminent writers on Law.) Retail price one cent, or fifty cents per hundred. Postage one cent per ounce.

WRITINGS

OF
WILLIAM GOODELL.

(Included in the preceding catalogue.)

THE DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, &c. &c.

In 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 871. Price, \$1.50. Postage pre-paid, \$1.80. This work is recommended by Rev. Dr. Aydelotte, late President of Woodward College, Ohio. Hon. Amasa Walker, late Secretary of State, Massachusetts, Prof. T. B. Hudson, Oberlin College, and Rev. E. Smith, Mansfield, Ohio; also by the New York Tribune, New York Evangelist, and other periodicals.

SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY.

A history of the great struggle in both Hemispheres, with a view of the Slavery-question in the United States. Pp. 606, royal 12mo. Price \$1. Postage pre-paid \$1.30.

This work is designed to embody a great amount of historical information in a single volume, conveniently arranged for reference. It contains fifty chapters, on as many distinct topics, embracing the most important facts in the political and ecclesiastical history of the contest, together with an account of the anti-slavery agitation in England and the United States, up to the present time: the divisions among American Abolitionists, and the various measures advocated among them; and closing with a brief discussion of the question, "What ought to be done?" The book is an abstract of several volumes, besides the anti-slavery history of the last twenty years, a great part of which has never before been collected into any volume, but lies scattered in the newspapers of that period. The Table of Contents and a copious alphabetical index will facilitate a reference to particular facts and to dates, when desirable.

THE AMERICAN SLAVE-CODE, IN THEORY AND PRACTICE.

Its Distinctive Features shown by its Statutes, Judicial Decisions, and illustrative facts. Pp. 430. 12mo. Price 75 cents. Postage pre paid, 92.

(From Hon. WILLIAM JAY to the author.)

"Your analysis of the Slave laws is very able, and your exhibition of their practical application by the Southern Courts evinces great and careful research. . . . It is more easy to make than to refute a charge of exaggeration against a work of fiction, like Mrs. Stowe's; but your book is as impregnable against such a charge as Euclid's Geometry, since, like that, it consists of propositions and demonstrations. The book is not only true, but it is unquestionable true."

AMERICAN SLAVERY A FORMIDABLE OBSTACLE TO THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

A prize Tract of 24 pages. Price \$3 per 100. Address WM. GOODELL, 48 Beekman street New York.

TOBITT'S COMBINATION-TYPE, 181 WILLIAM ST.